The Viceregal Homiletic:
An Appropriation of G.K. Beale's Christian Viceregency for Theological Consideration of Christian Preaching

A thesis submitted to Middlesex University
In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

by
Nathaniel M. Wright

Middlesex University
Supervised at the London School of Theology
with the A.J. Gordon Guild of Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary
September 2018

ABSTRACT

Nathaniel M. Wright, "The Viceregal Homiletic: An Appropriation of G.K. Beale's Christian Viceregency for Theological Consideration of Christian Preaching," Doctor of Philosophy, Middlesex University/London School of Theology, 2018.

This thesis argues that a particular perspective on Christian preaching, informed by the Christian concept of viceregency and summarily titled "the viceregal homiletic," is a new and distinct model for homiletical reflection. The viceregal homiletic's distinctiveness lies in its critical choice and development of G.K. Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency into an image for which to scrutinize the Christian preacher.

Chapter 1 of this thesis argues that the viceregal homiletic is distinct from existing homiletical reflection because it proceeds in a theological mode of reflection.

Chapter 2 of this thesis argues that the viceregal homiletic is distinct from existing homiletical reflection in the theological mode because it proceeds in a biblical-theological mode of reflection.

Chapter 3 introduces and critiques the biblical-theological method of G.K. Beale, and proposes its suitability to inform the viceregal homiletic's theological vision of Christian preaching.

Chapter 4 introduces and critiques G.K. Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency in order to clarify the viceregal homiletic's claim that the preacher is a Christian viceregent.

Chapter 5 differentiates the viceregal homiletic from homiletics of Jason Meyer, Thomas Long, and John Stott.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Credo in…sanctam ecclesiam catholicam.

In completing this doctoral thesis, I am deeply grateful for those with whom I share life and worship. In particular I am mindful of:

My dear wife Johanna, and our children, parents, extended families, and friends.

My pastor, Bill Cain, who showed me what preaching is.

My professor, Matthew Levering, who taught me what theology is.

My doctoral advisor, Scott Gibson, without whose invitation and patience this thesis would not exist.

My covenant group: Alan Conrow, Jürgen Liias, Sammy Wood, Joel Prather, Malcolm Reid, John Leggat, Caleb Miller, Troy Henley, and Adam Gosnell.

My colleagues of the Evangelical Homiletics Society and Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary, in particular Jeff Arthurs, Alex Kato, Joshua Peeler, Drew Thompson, Rick Lints, and David Wells.

My editor extraordinary, Meredith Conrow.

All those scholars whose work I have the privilege of engaging in this thesis.

Those fellowships of the Church catholic of which I and my family have been members:

Lebanon Presbyterian, Lebanon, Ohio
Montreat Presbyterian, Montreat, North Carolina
Christ Church Episcopal, Hamilton, Massachusetts
Covenant-First Presbyterian, Cincinnati, Ohio
Christ the Redeemer Anglican, Peabody, Massachusetts
Londonderry Presbyterian, Londonderry, New Hampshire
All Saints Anglican, Durham, North Carolina

And the triune God who sits on the throne, to whom we will give account, and from whom we have received truth and grace in our Lord Jesus Christ. To this God be honor and glory. "Because he turned his ear to me, I will call on him as long as I live."

I dedicate this work to my dear brother in faith and theology, Aaron M. Gies.

To all who read here, grace to you and peace in the name of the Lord Jesus.

List of Abbreviations

BTIC	Childs, Brevard S. *Biblical Theology in Crisis.* Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Westminster, 1974.
BTONT	Childs, Brevard S. *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible.* Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress, 1993.
NTBT	Beale, Gregory K. *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old in the New.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
TBR	Beale, Gregory K. *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
TCM	Beale, Gregory K. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God.* Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity, 2004.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Research Statement

This thesis argues that a particular perspective on Christian preaching, informed by the Christian concept of viceregency and summarily titled "the viceregal homiletic," is a new and distinct model for homiletical reflection. The viceregal homiletic's distinctiveness lies in its critical choice and development of G.K. Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency into a governing image for the Christian preacher.

Chapter Overview

Chapter 1 of this thesis argues that the viceregal homiletic is distinct from existing homiletical reflection because it proceeds in a theological mode of reflection.

Chapter 2 of this thesis argues that the viceregal homiletic is distinct from existing homiletical reflection in the theological mode because it proceeds in a biblical-theological mode of reflection.

Chapter 3 introduces and critiques the biblical-theological method of G.K. Beale, and proposes its suitability to inform the viceregal homiletic's theological vision of Christian preaching.

Chapter 4 introduces and critiques G.K. Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency in order to clarify the viceregal homiletic's claim that the preacher is a Christian viceregent.

Chapter 5 differentiates the viceregal homiletic from homiletics of Jason Meyer, Thomas Long, and John Stott.

The Conclusion summarizes the argument of the entire thesis, outlines its original contributions to the field of homiletics, and suggests topics for future study.

Initial Clarifications

No Practical Aim

The following thesis should not be understood as making practical proposals to improve Christian preaching today. Rather, this thesis focuses on homiletics – the study of Christian preaching – in order to propose how homiletics might better discuss what Christian preaching is. What follows, then, has been prepared without specific practical goals in mind; it does not seek to rectify a current crisis in the practice of Christian preaching, nor change public perception of Christian preaching, nor speculate on rules that should be developed or followed for better Christian preaching. Inasmuch as it does imply and propose a solution to a current problem, it proposes the importance of a particular way to perceive and describe Christian preaching – a biblical-theological mode of homiletics – and introduces one option for reflecting on Christian preaching in this way – the viceregal homiletic. If this option for reflecting on Christian preaching were to be exploited fully, it might well have practical implications for the practice of Christian preaching today, but these practical matters and possibilities lie outside the scope and direct argument of this thesis.

I assume here that discussions of ethics presuppose essence, that any profitable account of what some thing should do rests logically upon an account of what that thing is. Accordingly, the discussions of the following pages pursue the "what" of Christian preaching, and not the "should" of Christian preaching. I am not primarily concerned with the ethics of Christian preaching – that is, what should be done by a preacher or by the project of Christian preaching as a whole. I leave those ethical – and some would say more practical- questions to others. As a result, the discussions in this thesis are descriptive rather than prescriptive; they aim to forge a position from which all acts and aspects of Christian preaching can be observed and scrutinized, and then to present a bit of what that position sees.

"Homiletics" and "Christian Preaching"

This thesis uses the term "homiletics" to describe the discipline which examines and describes Christian preaching; "homiletical reflection" is reflection on what the act of Christian preaching is, and a "homiletic" describes a particular, unified account of what Christian preaching is, usually written by a particular homiletician or disciplined observer of Christian preaching. Correspondingly, "Christian preaching" describes the act of Christian preaching, including the entire process of researching, preparing, delivering, hearing, and reviewing Christian sermons.

As will become more evident in the following chapters, the viceregal homiletic offers the following working definition of Christian preaching:

Preaching is a redeemed human wisely naming creation. Preaching shares in God's viceregal reinvestiture of humans as the preacher works willingly and humbly under the constraint of God's prior speech to fill the entire earth with divine wisdom and glory. More than a trained exegete explaining the contemporary import of an ancient text, more than a chosen and empowered herald announcing a particular message, the preacher, redeemed in Jesus Christ, foreshadows humanity's viceregal representation of God himself. Preaching in this age, then, is a manifestation of the rule and speech of the already enthroned Jesus Christ as he rules in anticipation of his second advent.

Specifically, like Adam naming in Eden, the preacher names creation according to the prior speech of God. Using patterns of perception, thought, and speech derived from Scripture, Christian preaching aims to enrealm all aspects of contemporary reality under the lordship of Jesus Christ. In a sermon, then, the preacher strives to place his human perception and speech entirely under the holy constraint of God's prior words, in order to exhibit them publicly as realigned to God's kingdom in Jesus Christ. The preacher publicly and willingly participates in the Holy Spirit's redemption of human speech.

A Christian sermon thus manifests the truth that redemption has occurred and is occurring. It proclaims, by its mere existence, "Jesus is Lord," and "repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand." A sermon is a microcosmic re-enactment of Christ's

triumph over Satan; like Christ in the desert, it judges the proposals of Satan and the sinful world in light of God's prior speech and rejects them. In Christian preaching, humanity – both preacher and congregation- regains dominion over the serpent; and tastes the beginning of the eschatological beast's demise at Jesus Christ's appearing, and of the ennobling exaltation of redeemed humanity which that appearing will bring.

In this current age, Christian preaching is part of the redemptive project of God which will be completed at the second coming of Jesus Christ. Speaking according to God's prior speech recorded in the canon, Christian preaching anticipates the full redemption of human speech which will come at the renewal of all things. This means that, though preachers may say things that do not seem true at the time, the vindication of all Scripturally faithful Christian preaching will come at the last day.

To clarify, this definition of Christian preaching aims to remain helpful in describing a wide spectrum of phenomena, from Adam naming Woman in the garden, to the judges and prophets of the Old Testament preaching and writing, to the New Testament Church's preaching and correspondence, to the entirety of the Christian Church's public preaching witness since the resurrection of Christ, and finally to the speech of believers in the new creation. Any reader might note, rightly, that this way of defining Christian preaching is quite nonspecific. In an effort to encompass ideologically all acts and aspects of Christian preaching, I have purposefully allowed the discussion to remain undefined here. Over the history of the Church, Christian preaching has taken a wide variety of forms, and prescriptive accounts nearly always end up disqualifying one or more of these forms as sub-Christian or un-Christian. In keeping with my intent to describe rather than prescribe, my inquiry in the following thesis does not attend to how ideal or how erroneous any particular act of Christian preaching is. Rather, it proceeds in the spirit of questions like: what has Christian preaching been in all places and at all times? Inasmuch as any certain practice has been called, or could be called, "Christian preaching," why has it or why could it be so called? When one looks at something and identifies it as Christian preaching, what is it that one is seeing that causes it to be identified in that way?

I concede that such a broad and undefined way of discussing Christian preaching has inherent weaknesses, including, for example, a seeming inability to distinguish Christian preaching from other acts which involve a Christian speaking: prayer, confession, benediction, and other acts which often occur liturgically. In response, and as I hope the following thesis demonstrates, I believe the weaknesses inherent in this way of defining Christian preaching are outweighed by unique strengths also given by this definition. For example, this definition of Christian preaching creates new avenues of reflection and engagement for contemporary North American homiletics. Joined, as it must be, by the myriad other ways of describing and prescribing Christian preaching found in contemporary homiletics, the undeniably philosophical and ideological stance of this thesis may not offer a balanced account of Christian preaching within itself, yet aims to enter the homiletical discussion in order that homiletics as a whole might offer a more balanced account than it currently does.

Scope of the Discussion and Argument

This thesis limits the scope of its discussion and argument to homiletics in contemporary North America. Specifically, it is interested in how Christian preaching is observed and described in North America based on works published on Christian preaching which have proven influential there. Two points inform the choice to limit the scope in this way: the first is a practical concern; the body of Christian literature concerning Christian preaching is large, and some limit of inquiry is necessary for any argument to remain engaged and helpful. The second is an assumption that North America's homiletical discussion utilizes and produces a particular body of literature. If James Kay is correct,[1] North American seminaries have prioritized the formal, academic study of Christian preaching since the earliest days of theological education in the United States. Regardless of whether this has made the North American discussion unique

1. James F. Kay, "Reorientation: Homiletics as Theologically Authorized Rhetoric," *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 24.1 (2003): 16f.

relative to other discussions internationally, it remains that North American homileticians utilize a relatively unified body of literature, much of which is authored by North Americans, which might be read and critiqued as a whole. This thesis engages homiletical works unique and influential within that body of literature.

Why "Viceregency"?

A *viceregent* is one who rules in the name of a sovereign, particularly when the sovereign is not immediately present.[2] The English term *viceregency* denotes the office and/or reign of a viceregent.[3] This thesis looks to extend this idea in order to examine Christian preaching.

Some scholars have described Adam's office under God using the term viceregency, yet some also use the term *vicegerency*, which exchanges the "g" with the "r."[4] Due to different transliterations and patterns of use, vicegerency and viceregency are not only spelled nearly the same way but mean nearly the same thing.[5] This seems to have led some scholars to use the two terms interchangeably, and to mistake others' use of one or the other of the terms.[6]

Yet if this thesis extends Beale's theological reflection into homiletics, why does it choose "viceregency" rather than "vicegerency"? Moreover, throughout *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, Beale refers to Adam and Eve and their progeny

---

2. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "viceregency."

3. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "viceregency."

4. Most notably Dan G. McCartney, "Ecce Homo: The Coming of the Kingdom as the Restoration of Human Vicegerency," *Westminster Theological Journal* 56.1 (Spring 1994): 1-21.

5. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.vv. "vicegerency" and "viceregency."

6. E.g. Brian K. Payne, "The Summing Up of all Things in Christ and the Restoration of Human Viceregency: Implications for Ecclesiology" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2008). Payne's study misquotes McCartney's title – mistaking McCartney's "vicegerency" for "viceregency." Beale has the same mistake in his bibliographic citation of McCartney. Gregory K. Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011) 978.

using a variety of terms,[7] including "God's images,"[8] "image-bearers,"[9] "coruler[s],"[10] "kings,"[11] "priest-kings,"[12] "royal priests,"[13] and "vice-regents."[14] So why does the viceregal homiletic choose the term "viceregent" and its correlates to denote itself rather than one of these other terms used by Beale? Though Beale uses "vice-regent" throughout his work, why is it a better moniker than simply, for example, "king" or "divine image" or one of the several other terms?

As presented in the following chapters, Beale argues that through the Holy Spirit's redemptive and resurrecting work, the Church identifies with Jesus Christ by faith. Because Jesus is the second Adam, whose rule over the creation has begun, the Holy Spirit connecting contemporary believers to Jesus restores their Adamic position in the creation. In Christ, then, all Christians can be said to rule over creation today.

The viceregal homiletic uses the English term "viceregency" to denote Jesus Christ's rule as well as Christians' restored rule within Christ. Simply stated, this is because the meaning of the term "viceregent" aptly describes Christ's Adamic rule of creation under God, and therefore the position to which Christians are redeemed in Christ.

The viceregal homiletic uses this term for three additional reasons.

---

7. As Chapter 4 will demonstrate, Beale uses these terms to describe humans who are existing within their intended identity and relationship to God while functioning as divinely intended. Each term coheres within the broader story of Adamic humanity that Beale develops, which climaxes in Jesus Christ and looks forward to Christ's second advent.

8. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 916; "images of God," 78, 229.

9. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 36, 37, 38, 383, 384, 428, 450, 478, 752, 787, 959; "bearing God's image," 53.

10. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 891.

11. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 35, 36, 41, 59, 74, 88, 168, 176, 183, 208, 262, 741f.

12. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 32, 33, 34, 38, 66, 71, 88, 89, 115, 167, 188, 228, 891.

13. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 741f.

14. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 37, 41, 71, 172, 358, 382, 384, 420, 427, 450, 893, 916.

First, as just mentioned, some scholars have used the term *viceregency* as if it means the same thing as the term *vicegerency*.[15] However, both the Oxford English Dictionary as well as Klein's etymological dictionary differentiate the terms. Bothstate that the term *vicegerent* includes an aspect of one's appointment to the role. In contrast, the term *viceregent* emphasizes the regal identity of the bearer in addition to, and discrete from, his or her appointment to the role.[16]

This small difference has bearing upon why the viceregal homiletic chooses the term "viceregent" rather than other terms to describe redeemed humanity's identity and function in Christ. The viceregal homiletic, mindful of the Nicene theological tradition,[17] holds that Christ was not merely appointed to function as a human, but became and is a human. In and from his humanity, Christ rules creation. This understanding more closely coheres with the meaning of the term *viceregent* than *vicegerent*.

Alternatively, if Christ were described as a vicegerent, he could be described as being appointed to be the ruler of the world, yet not fully human of necessity. In this case, Christ's rule of the world would not necessarily be rooted in his identity as a human. A vicegerent Christ could, conceptually speaking, remain unincarnate and still function as vicegerent. This not only seems at odds with the ecumenical creeds of Christianity but also with Scripture, which seems to indicate that Christ's incarnation is essential to his mission.[18] The term "vicegerent" therefore simply does not go far enough in describing both the function and identity of Jesus Christ. "Viceregent," however, does.

---

15. E.g. Brian K. Payne, "The Summing Up of all Things in Christ and the Restoration of Human Viceregency: Implications for Ecclesiology." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2008. Also Beale, *NTBT*, 978.

16. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.vv. "vicegerency" and "viceregency." Ernest Klein, *Klein's Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1979) s.vv. "vicegerency" and "viceregency."

17. See esp. Athanasius, *On the Incarnation*.

18. E.g. John 3:16, esp. with John 1:1-14 in view.

The second reason the viceregal homiletic uses the term "viceregent" is that it differentiates Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency from other visions of Christian authority. On a lexical level, "viceregent" is a unique and rarely used term, and is therefore an appropriate moniker for the viceregal homiletic to use as it draws from Beale's unique articulation of Adamic-Christian authority. If the arguments presented in this thesis are correct, Beale has offered an articulation of Christian authority that differs in tone and content from others popularized in the last century in North America. Beale's use of "vice-regent" is part of this difference; the term "viceregent" is not frequently found in other popular articulations of Christians taking dominion over the earth.

The third reason the viceregal homiletic uses the term "viceregent" is that it represents a fresh approach to contemporary homiletical reflection as well. No homiletical reflection to date has explicitly extended Beale's proposal, despite Beale's suggestion that concludes *A New Testament Biblical Theology* – "A book on practical theology and preaching could be written on this topic, but I must leave that task to others..."[19] Though ideas central to the viceregal homiletic have been mentioned in recent homiletical literature,[20] a more complete and consistent exploration of Christian preaching in the light of Adamic viceregency restored in Christ is yet to emerge. In contemporary homiletics, terms such as "steward" and "herald" have been used to describe the preacher,[21] though many of these endeavors suffer from the deficiencies of the insight-theological mode, noted in Chapter 2. Use of the term "viceregent" and its correlates, then, differentiates the viceregal homiletic from both the nomenclature and methods of existing homiletical reflection.

In summary, then, the viceregal homiletic chooses the term "viceregent" because it describes appropriately the identity and function of Jesus, it

---

19. Beale, *NTBT*, 962.

20. Richard Lischer, *The End of Words: The Language of Reconciliation in a Culture of Violence* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008) 28f.

21. E.g. John R.W. Stott, *The Preacher's Portrait* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961) 9.

differentiates its understanding of how Christians exert God's authority, and it signals a new and unique model for homiletical reflection.

"Adamic," Gendered Pronouns, and Women Preaching

This thesis, including its use of gendered personal pronouns when referring to Christian preachers, does not attempt to make statements for or against any position in the discussions of whether Scripture and the Christian tradition sanction women preaching. Further, when this thesis states that Christian preaching is "Adamic" in character, the term "Adamic" indicates the entirety of the human person; it seeks to capture something close to the English term "humanity" and not man exclusive of woman, nor woman exclusive of man.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

"Homiletics in America has generally operated within a rhetorical, rather than a theological, frame of reference."[1] So notes James Kay in his 2002 inaugural lecture at Princeton Theological Seminary. Kay's lecture continues with a historical overview of seminary curricula in North America, arguing that James Witherspoon's centralizing of "sacred rhetoric" at Princeton in 1768 marked the beginning of rhetoric's dominance in preaching instruction and homiletical reflection. Kay claims that John Broadus's influential nineteenth-century textbook, *A Treatise in the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*, continued this rhetoric-centered trajectory.[2] In the twentieth century, Karl Barth's work,[3] which recast the rhetorical concerns of homiletics into categories built on dogmatic theology, created a hiatus from the hegemony of rhetoric in North American homiletics. However, the rhetorical frame reasserted itself in homiletics by the 1970s.[4] This reassertion coincided with homiletics turning to "an audience-attentive rhetorical framework" at the publication in 1971 of Fred Craddock's *As One Without Authority*.[5] Kay places David Buttrick's *Homiletic: Moves and Structures*,[6] published in 1987, in this stream of audience-attentive rhetorical

---

1. James F. Kay, "Reorientation: Homiletics as Theologically Authorized Rhetoric," *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 24.1 (2003): 16f.

2. Broadus wrote, "homiletics may be called a branch of rhetoric, or a kindred art." John A. Broadus, *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*, ed. Edwin C. Dargan (New York: A.C. Armstrong, 1898) 16.

3. See esp. Karl Barth, *Homiletics*, trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley and Donald E. Daniels (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, 1991), originally published as *Homiletik* (Zurich: EVZ-Verlag, 1966); and William H. Willimon's *Conversations with Barth on Preaching* (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon, 2006).

4. James F. Kay, "Reorientation," 27.

5. James F. Kay, "Reorientation," 26. Referring to Fred Craddock, *As One Without Authority* (St. Louis, Missouri: Chalice, 1971).

6. David Buttrick, *Homiletic: Moves and Structures* (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress, 1987).

homiletics,[7] and critiques a 1999 book, *Connecting with the Congregation* by Lucy Lind Hogan and Robert Reid,[8] as a contemporary example of the American "re-turn" to rhetoric in homiletics.[9]

Kay notes that Hogan and Reid present their book as "a basic *rhetoric* of preaching,"[10] and claim that a good sermon must function to "move and persuade people in the congregation."[11] After finding many "theological gaps" in Hogan and Reid's presentation of the subject matter of proclamation, Kay concludes that such theological oversights "do not seem to worry our authors, because the rules of rhetoric regulate the sermon…Rhetoric is the constant; theology is the variable."[12] Further examination of the theological agenda implied by Hogan and Reid's rhetoric-centric homiletic leads Kay to conclude it "thoroughly and confidently Pelagian, with consequences for every doctrine of the Christian faith."[13]

James Kay's identification of this Pelagianism is alarming for several reasons, the first reason being that it appears to be correct. Further clarification on this point from Kay, though, would be helpful. It seems that Kay uses the word "Pelagian" here to describe Hogan and Reid's confidence in human effort to accomplish the end of preaching: in their words, to communicate "the Word of God" to humans, "mediated by, and in, language, culture, and history."[14]

---

7. James F. Kay, "Reorientation," 26fn59.

8. Lucy Lind Hogan and Robert Reid, *Connecting with the Congregation: Rhetoric and the Art of Preaching* (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon, 1999).

9. James F. Kay, "Reorientation," 26.

10. Lucy Lind Hogan and Robert Reid, *Connecting with the Congregation*, 158, quoted in James F. Kay, "Reorientation," 26fn61.

11. Lucy Lind Hogan and Robert Reid, *Connecting with the Congregation*, 16, quoted in James F. Kay, "Reorientation," 28.

12. James F. Kay, "Reorientation," 29.

13. James F. Kay, "Reorientation," 30.

14. Lucy Lind Hogan and Robert Reid, *Connecting with the Congregation*, 16. Though they continue with, "The paradigm for this communication is the Incarnation," the authors never explain what they mean by it; their lack of theological engagement throughout the book implies that their view of the Incarnation may focus more on Christ as exemplar than Christ as the eternally begotten Son.

The Pelagian controversy which originally emerged in the fifth century touched many doctrinal issues centering on the nature of fallen humanity and the operation of grace.[15] Alister McGrath offers a succinct statement contrasting Pelagius's viewpoint, which was condemned as being outside the Christian tradition, with that of Augustine: "For Pelagius, humanity merely needed to be shown what to do, and could then be left to achieve it unaided [by grace]; for Augustine, humanity needed to be shown what to do, and then gently aided [by grace] at every point..."[16] When Kay states that Hogan and Reid's homiletic is "Pelagian," he appears to be claiming that their "rhetoric of preaching" implies that human effort is able, when given the right rhetorical examples, to mediate "the Word of God" to humans. No aid from grace is necessary.

If evaluated on these terms, Hogan and Reid's implied theological model is indeed Pelagian,[17] and more supporting examples from the book could be furnished.[18] This Pelagianism, or a human-centered homiletic, should be alarming for homileticians, for the claim that the preacher, through the use of effective rhetoric, mediates the Logos of God to the congregation seems to stand in direct opposition to statements from Scripture and the Christian theological

---

15. Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology: An Introduction* 3rd edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001) 448.

16. Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology*, 448.

17. However, Kay shrinks from noting that Hogan and Reid do not explicitly deny the need for grace to assist the rhetorically informed preacher, but view grace as an inevitable component of the preacher and congregation connecting. Their theological position might be more accurately described in relation to Paul Tillich's concept of *correspondence* rather than Pelagius's deficient understanding of grace. Hogan and Reid are asserting that preaching is "done" when persons use rhetoric to connect with others in conversation about ultimate questions. (See Hogan and Reid, 17-21, esp. the quote from Herbert Simons on 20.) Though an evangelical homiletician could agree with Kay that Hogan and Reid's book overemphasizes human effort apart from the grace of God, Hogan and Reid might answer that God's grace manifests only through the work – in this case, the communication – of humans, and therefore a rhetorical approach is always theological. Hogan and Reid are drawing not from Pelagianism, but a specialized form of theology which, because of its conflation of human and divine activity, also exalts human action in an inappropriate manner. Thus, Kay's charge of Pelagianism, though generally accurate, would be more appropriate if it noted the influence of Tillich. Cf. Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology*, 102f.

18. E.g. Hogan and Reid's "assumptions" about how they "theologically view preaching as a rhetorical act" on pp16f, or their statement, "Preaching is, therefore, an art predicated on a set of skills that can be learned." Lucy Lind Hogan and Robert Reid, *Connecting with the Congregation*, 20.

tradition which ultimately ascribe the effectiveness of Christian preaching to divine activity.[19] Kay is correct to raise the alarm.

Yet beginning with Kay's analysis of Hogan and Reid, more significant alarms begin to sound. First, throughout his address, Kay forwards the implication that homiletical reflection in the last three centuries in North America has proceeded with little acknowledgement of basic Christian theology.[20] It all might be Pelagian, but homileticians do not seem to care, for in Kay's words, "rhetoric is the constant, theology is the variable."[21] Kay infers that the practical effectiveness of preaching has been the governing concern for North American homiletics since the colonial era, with theological concerns being consistently relegated to a position of subsidiary importance. Further, Kay's discussion implies that from this position of subsidiary importance, theology is unable to defend itself from being warped according to the utilitarian priorities of rhetoric.[22] Thus, the broader alarms of Kay's analysis bring the entire history of North American homiletics under indictment.

Though a complete historical review of homiletics in North America is outside the scope of this chapter, the lack of explicit theological engagement in contemporary homiletics has been noted by other prominent homileticians.[23] In addition, even a cursory survey of contemporary homiletical reflection reveals that rhetorical analyses are in the majority.[24] These rhetoric-centered reflections

---

19. E.g. Acts 16:14. "…and the Lord opened her heart to respond to Paul's message."

20. James F. Kay, "Reorientation," 16-30.

21. James F. Kay, "Reorientation," 29.

22. In the case of Hogan and Reid, the rhetorical focus implied a Pelagian theology rather than a Christian theology, but other rhetorical-centric homiletical reflection could imply other departures from historic Christian theology.

23. E.g. Richard Lischer, *A Theology of Preaching: The Dynamics of the Gospel* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2001) 1; Michael Pasquarello III, *Christian Preaching: A Trinitarian Theology of Proclamation* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2011) 39-49.

24. E.g. Andy Stanley and Lane Jones, *Communicating for a Change* (Sisters, Oregon: Multnomah Publishers, 2006); Charles W. Koller, *How to Preach Without Notes* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997); Herbert Lockyer, *The Art and Craft of Preaching* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1975); Thomas H. Troeger, *Ten Strategies for Preaching in a Multimedia Culture* (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon, 1996); Warren W. Wiersbe, *Preaching & Teaching with Imagination: The Quest for*

often imply, like Hogan and Reid, questionable theological claims underlying their rhetorical agendas.

Take, for example, evangelical R. Larry Moyer's book *Show Me How To Illustrate Evangelistic Sermons.*[25] Moyer's book as a whole appears to depend upon the presupposition that the effectiveness of preaching is of central importance, for, similar to Hogan and Reid, it forwards a rhetoric of preaching aimed at increasing the preacher's effectiveness. In the midst of this rhetorical discussion, however, Moyer seems to suggest that a poor illustration may be all that stands between hearers and eternal damnation:

> As the Holy Spirit works through an effectively used illustration, unbelievers will say, "I understand what God is saying to me." When your Savior becomes their Savior by truth, illuminated through a well-used illustration, that is something of eternal value.[26]

One theological question untouched by this quote is whether a poor illustration could ever be sufficient to scuttle God's saving purposes for an individual's life. Regardless of Moyer's personal conviction regarding this question, his rhetoric-centered approach to homiletics raises a significant theological question which goes unaddressed.

Speaking more broadly of contemporary homiletics, a majority of the books cited on Michael Duduit's "The 25 Most Influential Preaching Books of the Last 25 Years" are marked by a similar lacuna of explicit theological

---

Biblical Ministry (Wheaton, Illinois: Victor, 1994); Richard L. Eslinger, *A New Hearing: Living Options in Homiletic Methods* (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon, 1987); Harold Freeman, *Variety in Biblical Preaching: Innovative Techniques and Fresh Forms* (Waco, Texas: Word Books, 1987); David L. Larsen, *The Anatomy of Preaching: Identifying the Issues in Preaching Today* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989); Stuart Briscoe, *Preach It!* (Loveland, Colorado: Group, 2004); Wayne McDill, *The 12 Essential Skills for Great Preaching* (Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman & Holman, 1994); Paige Patterson, "Ancient Rhetoric: A Model for Text-Driven Preachers," in Daniel L. Akin, David Allen, and Ned L. Matthews, *Text-Driven Preaching* (Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman & Holman, 2010).

25. R. Larry Moyer, *Show Me How to Illustrate Evangelistic Sermons* (Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2012).

26. R. Larry Moyer, *Show Me*, 11.

concern.[27] Of the books noted by Duduit, only four develop preaching with what Kay might call an explicitly theological frame, while eleven proceed from an explicitly rhetorical frame. Two are compilations and therefore do not fit easily into either camp, and the remaining eight contain little theological governance, though they are not without theology being mentioned. If these examples are taken to be representative of the general state of contemporary North American homiletics, they reveal a widespread uninterest in fostering theological specificity as much as rhetorical specificity. Kay's words therefore seem accurate for describing the dominant pattern of contemporary homiletical reflection in North America: "rhetoric is the constant; theology is the variable."[28]

Though Kay's choice to describe contemporary homiletics according to two frames certainly invites further clarification,[29] his critique and discussion move the discerning reader to wonder what benefit theological reflection might bring to contemporary homiletics. In light of Kay's indictment that North American homiletics has generally proceeded from a rhetorical rather than a theological frame, what advantages has it missed or dismissed in doing so? Concomitantly, what strengths does North American homiletical reflection exhibit due to its centralization of rhetorical analyses? To these questions we will return in a moment.

Purpose of this Chapter

This brings us to the purpose of this chapter. This chapter traces out deficits in contemporary North American homiletical reflection, in preparation for future chapters to trace out the uniqueness of the viceregal homiletic. Unlike the dominant, rhetorical mode of reflection in North American homiletics, the

---

27. Michael Duduit, "The 25 Most Influential Preaching Books of the Past 25 Years," *Preaching*, February 5, 2010, accessed August 16, 2018, http://www.preaching.com/sermon-illustrations/11625882/.

28. James F. Kay, "Reorientation," 29.

29. James F. Kay, "Reorientation," 31-35, esp. 33f.

viceregal homiletic proceeds with both theological and rhetorical insights in mind.

Theological Reflection in Homiletics

We now turn to the question of this chapter; what benefit does theological reflection offer to contemporary homiletics? As mentioned, Kay differentiates what he calls a rhetorical frame of reference from a theological frame of reference. But in doing so, Kay seems to leave open a significant question: are the two frames completely different from one another? Do they overlap at all, or must homiletical reflection be divided into two camps: rhetorical and theological?

Other contemporary homileticians have, at times, implied a binary relationship between rhetorical and theological reflection.[30] But a simple binary analysis does not account for the variety in homiletical reflection; articles and books of contemporary homiletical reflection do not easily fall into two categories of either rhetorical or theological. Theological and rhetorical reflection in homiletics regularly cohabit the same article, and even the same paragraph.

For instance, Haddon Robinson's *Biblical Preaching*[31] spends the majority of its discussion advising preachers how to prepare and deliver expository sermons. It is, by word count, more focused on rhetorical than theological concerns. Yet from time to time Robinson clearly writes of preaching in relation to God, that is, theologically.[32] Robinson consequently implies that his presentation of the rhetorical aspects of preaching should be viewed in light of its theological aspects: that the need to construct a sermon well should be put into

---

30. E.g. David Buttrick's foreword in Craig A. Loscalzo, *Preaching Sermons That Connect: Effective Communication Through Identification* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity, 1992) 9-11. The implied binary is also evident in the perennial discussion of whether the art of persuasion has a legitimate role in Christian preaching. E.g. Richard Lischer, "Why I am Not Persuasive," *Homiletic* 24.2 (Winter 1999): 13-16.

31. Haddon W. Robinson, *Biblical Preaching: The Development and Delivery of Expository Messages* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980).

32. E.g. 16. Robinson's last chapter likens the preacher to the boy who offered the five loaves and two fishes which Jesus multiplied to feed the crowd. Haddon W. Robinson, *Biblical Preaching* 2nd edition, 221-224.

perspective by remembering that it is the Holy Spirit who is at work through preaching.[33]

There are several influential examples of homiletical reflection like Robinson's work, wherein theological statements are implicit, though explicit from time to time.[34] It is therefore unclear whether such reflection proceeds from, to use Kay's words, a rhetorical or a theological frame of reference. It seems that the two frames overlap, and that therefore any binary division of the literature is an oversimplification. The presupposition, here under question, seems to be: whatever is not rhetorical is theological, and whatever is not theological is rhetorical. But as shown in the work of Haddon Robinson, this analysis is simply untenable.

Pitting one frame against the other is one way of implying a binary relationship between rhetorical and theological reflection. This is observable in Kay's work noted above, wherein positioning the two frames against one another allows him an easy vantage point to critique Hogan and Reid. Though he notes, rightly, that simply affirming the necessity for both frames does not adequately define their interrelationship,[35] his proposal for how theology "authorize[s] rhetorical judgments, made on rhetorical grounds, with respect to preaching"[36] simply reasserts theology's precedence over rhetoric without offering an explanation as to why this should be the case. On the other hand, other homileticians blindly assert rhetoric's precedence over theology, illustrating that the oversimplification can be used martially in both directions.[37] Without

---

33. Cf. Robinson's definition of expository preaching; Haddon W. Robinson, *Biblical Preaching*, 21.

34. E.g. John A Broadus, *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*, ed. Edwin C. Dargan (New York: A.C. Armstrong, 1898); or more recently, John MacArthur, *Rediscovering Expository Preaching* (Dallas, Texas: Word, 1992); and Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, 1989).

35. James F. Kay, "Reorientation," 32.

36. James F. Kay, "Reorientation," 33.

37. E.g. David Buttrick's foreword to Craig Losalsco, *Preaching Sermons that Connect*, 9-11. Richard Eslinger's *The Web of Preaching: New Options in Homiletical Method* (Nashville,

broader explanations, however, this assertion does not adequately account for theological and rhetorical reflection coexisting in homiletics, and, because of their coexistence, how the two differ in their contributions.

Thus, the central question at hand seems to remain: what does theological reflection offer to homiletics? Now though, by rejecting a binary relationship between theology and rhetoric, we ask this question understanding that theological reflection, whatever it offers, may be interspersed with rhetorical reflection in homiletics, and vice versa. With this in mind, the question at hand has become: what does theological reflection offer to homiletics discrete from rhetorical reflection, though they might intermingle? When, for example, Haddon Robinson or another homiletician makes theological statements about preaching in the midst of their broadly rhetorical description of preaching, what do those statements offer the reader different than the rhetorical content?

Newman and The Idea of a University

At this point it is helpful to retreat for a time to a broader topic of discussion in order to pursue the question of what theological reflection, though often interspersed with rhetorical reflection, offers to contemporary homiletics. For this, we turn to two insights drawn from John Newman.

John Newman's *The Idea of a University* consists of nine discourses which grew out of Newman's own work as a theologian and rector of the Catholic University in nineteenth-century Dublin.[38] Its pattern of discussion, accurately called "very challenging" by some scholars, arises from the questions Newman faced in the founding and operation of the university.[39] Though perhaps open to

---

Tennessee: Abingdon, 2002) esp. 11-14, also may imply a similar blind assertion of rhetoric over theology.

38. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, ed. Frank M. Turner (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University, 1996) xiv.

39. Frank M. Turner, "Reading *The Idea of a University*," in John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, ed. Frank M. Turner (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University, 1996) xiv.

the charge of being overly idealistic,[40] Newman's insights remain influential and fecund both inside and outside Roman Catholicism today,[41] and provide a suitable conversation partner for this discussion of what theological reflection contributes to contemporary homiletical reflection.

Newman's contribution to the homiletical discussion of this chapter stems from comments he makes regarding an intellectually defensible role for theology among the sciences, as well as his general argument regarding the distinct quality of university education in comparison to professional instruction. We will address these two contributions in that order.

Newman on Theology and the Sciences

First, Newman's argument that theology has an intellectually defensible role in the university offers insight into what theological reflection provides homiletics. Many of Newman's comments on this topic are found in the third discourse, "The Bearing of Theology on Other Branches of Knowledge,"[42] which concludes with the key statement: "Religious Truth is not only a portion, but a condition, of general knowledge."[43] This statement seems to summarize Newman's thought regarding the importance of theology for education. Religious, or theological, truth, says Newman, is a condition of general knowledge. Rather than being merely a branch of knowledge with its own university department, theology plays a foundational role in any kind of knowledge about the world. Newman claims that it is impossible for Christians to hold their Christian faith, particularly its universal claims, in abeyance as they study any part of the creation.[44] The

---

40. Cf. Edward T. Oakes, "Newman's Ideal University," *First Things* (March 2011): 35f.

41. E.g. From the Roman Catholics, the Vatican directives to institutions of higher education *Ex Corde Ecclesiae*, Vatican, (1990), and *Ad Tuendam Fidem* (1998); and among Protestants, James W. Sire, *Discipleship of the Mind: Learning to Love God in the Ways We Think* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity, 1990) esp. 156-159. Cf. also "Christian Liberal Arts Education," Report of the Calvin College Curriculum Study Committee, 1970 (Grand Rapids: Calvin College and Eerdmans, 1970).

42. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 40-57.

43. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 57.

44. Though earlier in his discussion Newman argues from the basis of "Natural Theology" so that his vision of a university will be relevant to all humans, regardless of their

Christian faith is a "system of revealed facts and principles" which exerts universal claims upon all of reality.[45] For a Christian, then, considering theology is a condition of studying anything. Without theology, says Newman, university education becomes like a year without spring, or a Greek tragedy without the tragic hero.[46] Removing theology, as a department, from the university therefore not only "impairs the completeness"[47] of the knowledge which a university teaches, but, in a way, invalidates everything else taught by the university's various departments.

Yet the claim itself, that university education is, in a way, invalidated without theology, probably overstates the point. Newman seems to be claiming that studies in mathematics, physics, or medicine are invalidated without theological study. The claim is perhaps more understandable if one assumes that, within Newman's Victorian-era context, some level of adherence to Christianity was expected by society. In addition, at that time Newman was not witness to the advances in science and medicine, advances seemingly unrelated to the faith commitments of scientists, which the intervening one hundred fifty years have brought in Western civilization. From a contemporary vantage point, therefore, the idea that scientific investigations apart from Christian faith lack legitimacy seems difficult to accept. Though Christians may, it seems, assert that the deepest foundations of science rest upon Christian presuppositions about the natural world,[48] explicit recognition of Newman's claim is quite rare in the scientific community. To accept Newman uncritically on this point, therefore, seems untenable.

---

theism or Roman Catholic faith, it is important to note that, at this point in his discussion, his argument has narrowed so as only to pertain to Roman Catholics.

45. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 57.

46. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 57.

47. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 57.

48. E.g. the work of Thomas F. Torrance, especially his understanding of the concept of contingency, which will be discussed below.

The work of twentieth century theologian Thomas F. Torrance offers a more nuanced understanding of this issue. Torrance's work, which critiques the philosophy of science in light of Christian theology, asserts that Christian theology alone provides reliable grounds on which scientific inquiry can, with internal congruence, proceed. In this Torrance has much in common with Newman. However, Torrance also notes that, according to the Scriptural witness and Christian theological tradition, the universe is itself a consistently ordered and structured whole. Creation is therefore open to investigation by scientists, whether they are believers or not. Torrance developed a uniquely Christian understanding of the philosophical concept of *contingency* to describe these two facets of creation: its utter dependence upon God as well as its own integrity and inner coherence apart from God.[49] Torrance's Christian model of contingency elucidates creation's dependence upon God, and therefore aligns with what Newman claimed regarding creation's ultimate inscrutability apart from theological consideration. Yet Torrance's model also affirms that creation itself can be examined in the search for creation's inherent rationality. It therefore offers a necessary corrective to Newman's claim by affirming that scientific inquiry can be performed without the scientist possessing knowledge of Christian theology.

Concerning this, Torrance states that "God has conferred upon the creation and continues to maintain an authentic reality and integrity and a

---

49. Torrance begins by noting that in both Ancient Greek and Kantian philosophies, a thing contingent is something which is ultimately unnecessary to the central argument being considered. In contrast, Torrance's understanding of contingency implies "an interlocking of dependence and interdependence," because the central contingent thing within Christian theology, the creation, was created by God out of his own free love. Creation, Torrance holds, is not ultimately unnecessary in God's plan, but is contingent nonetheless in the sense of being entirely dependent upon him, and receiving its inherent internal structures and rationality from him.

This distinction Torrance makes between Christian contingency and other philosophical models of contingency is significant, for historic Christian orthodoxy holds that God reveals himself to humankind ultimately in the Incarnation of Jesus Christ. Creation is therefore necessary in God's plan, for it is the medium through which God reveals himself and accomplishes redemption.

Cf. Thomas F. Torrance, *The Ground and Grammar of Theology* (Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia, 1980) 52-60.

genuine order of its own which we must respect."[50] In saying "we must respect" creation's own "genuine order," Torrance justifies the entire Western scientific project, which seeks to trace out the order of the creation, particularly in relation to itself. Scientific inquiry devoid of any theistic premises remains legitimate, for creation does have order within itself that is real and discernible. From Torrance's perspective, scientific inquiry, even scientific inquiry done by secular atheists, is beneficial in an overall project of understanding God's creation.

However, Torrance claims, such a scientific tracing out of creation's features, patterns, and laws is not ultimately satisfactory in penetrating to the true grounding or basic reality of the world: that the Christian God created and sustains the world. Science therefore falls short in describing reality in its fullness, for the creation which science investigates is entirely contingent upon a God to which science ultimately cannot reach. The same contingency which grants order to the creation limits science's ability to penetrate to the deepest rationality inherent in creation.[51]

This insight helps qualify Newman's assertion that studies in mathematics, physics, or medicine are less valuable if done without theological study. In contrast, Torrance's model of contingency affirms that mathematics, physics, and medicine have integrity in their own right because they seek to trace out areas of the creation. Though persons without Christian faith will be unable to perceive

---

50. Thomas F. Torrance, "The Ground and Grammar of Theology," Lecture 4, given at Fuller Theological Seminary (1981), cassette tape recording.

51. Thomas F. Torrance, "The Ground and Grammar of Theology," Lecture 4. Cf. Thomas F. Torrance, *The Ground and Grammar of Theology* (Charlottesville, Virginia: University of Virginia, 1980) 52-60. Torrance asserts:

> On the one hand, then, the contingence of the universe and its rational order implies that the universe as a whole and in all its constituent features, patterns, and laws, has an autonomous character that must be respected so that everything that takes place within it must be investigated in accordance with its natural right and integrity. On the other hand, however, the contingence of the universe and its rational order implies that nothing going on in the universe can be finally understood or explained in terms of universal laws or necessary truths immanent in the universe, for the deepest secret of the universe lies outside its own contingent reality. In other words, the universe, instead of being closed in upon itself, constitutes an open system with an ontological and intelligible reference beyond its own limits to an ultimate ground of being and rationality upon which it depends for the internal consistency of its structure and its order.

the ultimate grounds of their disciplines, that is, God's person and work, unbelieving persons nevertheless can perceive creation's order to such an extent that their studies of the creation accurately reflect what God has made. Mathematics, physics, and medicine are therefore valuable in themselves without theological study.

But how does this relate to homiletics? Based on this insight from Newman and Torrance, it is possible to suggest that the theological mode of homiletical reflection can be differentiated from the rhetorical mode of homiletical reflection by its explicit acknowledgement that the ultimate ground of Christian preaching is the Christian God. Theological reflection relates preaching to God; rhetorical reflection does not. To return to Newman, if the Christian faith's system of revelation exerts ultimate claims upon all of reality – and it does – theological reflection in homiletics offers an explicit response to those claims by investigating how the act of preaching is created and sustained by the Christian God. Theological reflection in homiletics explicitly seeks to ground Christian preaching in its ultimate reality, God's person and work, and therefore regularly transacts its reflection with God in view. Theological reflection in homiletics consequently depends upon the homiletician personally embracing faith in Jesus Christ.

At the same time, Thomas Torrance's insight regarding contingency grants a helpful paradigm for interpreting the value of rhetorical reflection in homiletics. Rhetorical reflection, like other non-theological disciplines, does have the ability to trace out the order of a particular area of creation. The patterns of human communication which rhetorical analyses trace out are part of God's creation and thus possess divinely-ordered integrity. Rhetorical analyses of preaching therefore have integrity in their own right inasmuch as they rightly describe the ordered integrity of human communication. Though persons without Christian faith will be unable to perceive the ultimate grounds of human speech communication, that is, God's person and work, unbelieving persons nevertheless can perceive human communication's order enough that their

rhetorical reflection upon the act of preaching can accurately reflect what God has made.

Rhetorical analyses and models therefore play legitimate and essential roles in homiletics. Rhetorical homiletics is correct to assert that preaching is never something less than a speech.[52] Human communication is part of the contingent creation, and therefore has a real and observable internal consistency. What rhetorical analyses, like science, cannot alone do is reach beyond the act of preaching to its ultimate grounds. In order to grasp these fundamental, essential truths of preaching, theological reflection, with its prerequisite faith in the Christian God, becomes necessary.

Theological reflection therefore offers homiletics the ability to describe preaching in light of the Christian God, thus grasping preaching's ultimate grounds, and proceeds from a distinctly Christian vantage point. Unlike rhetorical reflection for homiletics, which considers and describes the act of preaching according to its own intrinsic order, theological reflection offers insights about preaching which reach beyond its own intrinsic order to the One who has ordered it.[53]

Revisiting, for a moment, the argument of this entire chapter, the insight that theological reflection offers homiletics the ability to describe preaching in light of the Christian God begins to shed light on why the viceregal homiletic scrutinizes preaching from a different perspective than the majority of contemporary homiletical reflection. The majority of contemporary homiletical reflection proceeds in a rhetorical mode, scrutinizing preaching's own internal order and consistency as a rhetorical act. The viceregal homiletic, however, proceeds in a wholly theological mode, reflecting almost exclusively upon the act

---

52. Lucy Lind Hogan and Robert Reid, *Connecting with the Congregation*, 16.

53. Theological reflection in homiletics therefore offers insight which does not inherently conflict or negate rhetorical reflection, but which differs in its ability to describe the ultimate grounds of preaching. The following section's discussion of Newman on education versus instruction will expand a bit on this interrelationship.

of preaching in relation to its ultimate grounds in God himself. For now this is enough to note, yet more light will be shed on the nature of this difference in the next point.

Thus, the first point on which John Newman's *The Idea of a University* offers helpful insight for theological reflection in homiletics pertains to Newman's understanding of theology's role in relation to the sciences, with some additional cues taken from Thomas Torrance. This reveals that rhetoric describes what preaching as speech communication is, while theology is able to reach beyond preaching to grasp its ultimate grounds in the Christian God.

Newman on Education versus Instruction

The second point on which John Newman's *The Idea of a University* offers helpful insight for theological reflection in homiletics pertains to different kinds of educations.[54] Newman argues that a university "education" differs from the "instruction" gained at a professional school, and that this difference has to do with the usefulness of the knowledge imparted. This section of our chapter will propose that this difference between education and instruction corresponds with some of the differences between theological reflection for homiletics and rhetorical reflection for homiletics.

Newman writes, regarding what he calls "instruction" which is offered at a professional or vocational school:

> We are instructed…in manual exercises, in the fine and useful arts, in trades, and in ways of business; for these are methods, which have little or no effect upon the mind itself, are contained in rules committed to memory, to tradition, or to use, and bear upon it an end external to themselves.[55]

Newman writes that instruction aims to convey specific methods, or rules, for manual exercises, trades, or business. The goal of these methods and manual exercises is to create a product or business transaction; instruction is not desirable

---

54. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, esp. 76-91.

55. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 85.

simply for itself, but for the products or business which will issue from being instructed in helpful methods and rules. One is instructed, then, to learn a skill which produces a product, and the skill taught is valuable for what it produces.

On the other hand, Newman claims that education, in contrast to instruction, aims to form the mind itself. Education conveys a knowledge which is itself its own end.[56] The mind in receipt of this education expands not only in its store of information, but in its own "culture of mind" which systematically interprets and arranges the information it receives. The person in possession of education, and not only instruction, has a mind fitted for evaluating and ordering ideas; he is a kind of philosopher. Newman writes that the person with education, therefore,

> …possesses knowledge, not only of things, but also of their mutual and true relations; knowledge, not merely considered as acquirement, but as philosophy. Accordingly, when this analytical, distributive, harmonizing process is away, the mind experiences no enlargement, and is not reckoned as enlightened or comprehensive, whatever it may add to its knowledge. For instance, a great memory…does not make a philosopher, any more than a dictionary can be called a grammar. There are men who embrace in their minds a vast multitude of ideas, but with little sensibility about their real relations towards each other…If they are nothing more than well-read men, or men of information, they have not what specially deserves the name of culture of mind, or fulfills the type of…Education.[57]

Of particular importance here for Newman is education's fostering of an "analytical, distributive, harmonizing process" which enlarges the mind itself as it locates things in their "mutual and true relations." Simply retaining particular facts, skills, or methods, which are conveyed through what Newman calls instruction, exercises a different faculty – memory – than the enlargement of mind fostered by what Newman calls education. Elsewhere he writes that true education tends towards a unification of all knowledge in the mind of the

---

56. Newman's fifth discourse is named "Knowledge its own End." John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 76.

57. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 98.

educated person, granting a view of the entire world as a system of interrelated parts. He writes:

> That only is true enlargement of mind which is the power of viewing many things at once as one whole, of referring to them severally to their true place in the universal system, of understanding their respective values, and determining their mutual dependence. Thus is that form of Universal Knowledge…set up in the individual intellect, and constitutes its perfection. Possessed of this real illumination, the mind never views any part…without recollecting that it is but a part, or without the associations that spring from this recollection. It makes every thing in some sort lead to every thing else…so, in the mind of the [educated person], the elements of the physical and moral world…are all viewed as one, with correlative functions, and as gradually by successive combinations converging, one and all, to the true center.[58]

In contrast to instruction, education fosters an analytical process which relates every thing in the world to every thing else, so that the mind of the educated person sees the world as an interrelated whole. It is only with this broader understanding of reality that particular things can be perceived and understood truly. The educated mind is therefore ready to reflect truly on the world, and not merely interested in the practical results which come under the purview of instruction.

Thus, for John Newman, the word "education" described a process whereby the mind of the learner was fitted for "perception of its own proper object, and for its own highest culture,"[59] and formed the "habit of pushing things up to their first principles," that is, the habit of connecting new ideas to an ever-expanding, systematic, unified view of the world.[60] In contrast, instruction meant the mind was "being formed or sacrificed to some particular or accidental purpose, some specific trade or profession, or study or science."[61]

---

58. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 99f.

59. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 109.

60. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 116. Responding to John Locke, "Some Thoughts Concerning Education," in *The Works of John Locke, the twelfth edition* (London: C. and J. Rivington, 1824) 152f.

61. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 109.

Throughout *The Idea of a University* it seems clear that Newman's argument in favor of education and against mere instruction is a bit polemical. Though he does, in Discourse VII, address "Knowledge Viewed in Relation to Professional Skill,"[62] his discussion does little to justify what today would be called a research university because it simply does not acknowledge the enduring importance of methods and skills. This may be the weakest area of the book,[63] for Newman fails to describe a coherent interrelationship between education and instruction.[64] In discourse seven, when he could have moderated his polemical opposition to instruction by noting its necessity for society, he simply reasserted education's importance over instruction.[65]

A century later, Whitney Griswold, then the president of Yale University, perhaps better described the interrelationship when he noted that John Stuart Mill, champion of utilitarian education, did not himself see a conflict between "the old classical studies and the new scientific studies."[66] Griswold claims that Mill denied that this conflict had any foundation in principle whatsoever.[67] For Griswold, the value of utilitarian instruction was not eclipsed by the assertion that liberal arts education was important for the societal health of the United States.[68] This differs from Newman's near-elimination of "useful knowledge" from the university, and throws into sharp relief the polemical nature of Newman's *Idea*.

Those who seek to maintain the contemporary validity of Newman's *Idea* have asserted that it does not, in actuality, argue against the values of a research

---

62. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 108-126.

63. Cf. Martha M. Garland, "Newman in His Own Day," in *The Idea of a University*, 271f.

64. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 116f.

65. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 108-126.

66. Alfred W. Griswold, "Liberal Education is Practical Education," in *Liberal Education and the Democratic Ideal and other essays* (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University, 1964) 13f.

67. Alfred W. Griswold, "Liberal Education is Practical Education," 1-7.

68. Cf. Alfred W. Griswold, "Liberal Education is Practical Education," 14.

university of today.[69] But such assertions seem to go directly against the plain meaning of much of what Newman chose to publish.

Yet if the observation, earlier noted, that Newman's work is idealistic[70] is correct, perhaps Newman's overreaching on this point can be accepted. Rather than being read like a polemic against specific, actual practices, perhaps Newman's *Idea* is best taken in a non-practical manner. This would allow his observations about a university to be seen as, themselves, part of a philosophical ordering of elements of the intellectual and moral world and their interrelations, rather than a handbook or method for creating a university.[71] If this proposal is accurate, it may explain why Newman's work remains a perennial conversation partner in the discussion of liberal arts education, even though it is perennially dismissed as fundamentally unaware of contemporary university realities.[72] Perhaps, by focusing on what he saw as enduring, formal differences in university pedagogical choices, he simply did not mean the *Idea* to be essentially practical. Perhaps Newman was offering an apologia for how he saw his own rectorship in Dublin converging with a broader, enduring Christian structure of the formation of persons for society and the Church. It seems right to assume that Newman would argue his case for university education by following the same values in

---

69. Cf. Ian Ker, "Newman's Idea of a University and Its Relevance for the 21st Century," *Australian eJournal of Theology* 18.1 (April 2011).

70. Edward T. Oakes, "Newman's Ideal University," 35f.

71. Though initially this proposal seems to go against what Newman scholar Frank M. Turner has written, "Newman was no educational utopian," a closer look reveals no conflict. Turner argues that the utopian elements of Newman's work have been misinterpreted by modernist scholars in the twentieth century who failed to grasp Newman's dependence upon Roman Catholic doctrine. These writers took Newman's work to say that liberal education would solve the problems of society. Yet the Roman Catholic Newman, claims Turner, believed that the solution to society's evil did not lie in education, liberal or otherwise, but in "a divine order of truth which the Roman Catholic Church possessed and taught." Frank M. Turner, "Newman's University and Ours," in *The Idea of a University*, 289.

72. Cf. Martha M. Garland's conclusions regarding Newman's contemporary relevance in "Newman in His Own Day," in *The Idea of a University*, 281: "It is unlikely that we, any more than nineteenth-century Ireland, can afford to educate our elites only to be elegant generalists, ladies, or gentlemen." Cf. also Sara Castro-Klaren, "The Paradox of Self," in *The Idea of a University*, 338.

writing the *Idea* as the values he commends therein by arguing not on practical, but on philosophical grounds for the validity of his project.

If this is correct, it means that the nearly impossible standards for universities implied by Newman in the *Idea* actually function as ideals towards which to strive. This would mean that the *Idea*'s idealism, sometimes noted with moderate disapproval,[73] is actually a positive characteristic of his developed philosophical vision.

Whatever the precise reason for Newman's polemical tone against mere instruction, Newman's insights can nevertheless bring significant light to this chapter's current discussion regarding what theological reflection offers to contemporary homiletics.

Based on the ubiquity of books published on homiletical methods and developing skills of preachers, it seems clear that much of contemporary homiletical reflection understands the discipline of homiletics as a project in what Newman calls instruction. Homiletical instruction concerns teaching preachers how to preach; it aims to develop the skills preaching requires. Again taking Michael Duduit's list of the most influential books in the last twenty-five years of homiletics as a representative example,[74] the vast majority of the books on the list are centrally concerned with this homiletical instruction.[75] Over the last decade, the selection of papers published by the Academy of Homiletics as well as the Evangelical Homiletics Society reveals a similar overwhelming interest in instruction.[76] This is unsurprising, given that professors of communication and

---

73. Edward T. Oakes, "Newman's Ideal University," 35f.

74. Michael Duduit, "The 25 Most Influential Preaching Books of the Past 25 Years."

75. Only three of the books on the list aim to describe more generally what preaching is while forwarding no specific homiletical method. These three are John R.W. Stott's *Between Two Worlds* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), John Piper's *The Supremacy of God in Preaching* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990), and Barbara B. Taylor's *The Preaching Life* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Cowley, 1993).

76. For archives of *Homiletic*, the journal of the Academy of Homiletics, see http://www.homiletic.net/ojs/index.php/homiletic/issue/archive. For archives of *The Journal of the Evangelical Homiletics Society*, see http://ehomiletics.com/members/journals/.

homiletics at seminaries, divinity schools, and Bible schools train students for Christian ministry. Instruction, and not education, is the regnant concern in contemporary homiletics.

With this in mind, we can revisit the question posed earlier: what does theological reflection, though often interspersed with rhetorical reflection, uniquely offer to contemporary homiletics?

If this section's observations are correct, then a new insight has emerged regarding what theological reflection offers homiletics. Theological reflection primarily fosters a philosophical understanding of the act of preaching rather than a practical understanding. The basic building block of such a philosophical understanding involves reaching beyond the act of preaching itself to preaching's ultimate grounds, as mentioned in the previous section of this chapter. This is what Newman calls "pushing things up to their first principles."[77] Habitually doing this, however, the educated mind belies an ongoing "analytical, distributive, harmonizing process"[78] which builds and proceeds from a unified understanding of all reality, and is therefore able to examine and assign relative value to many different things at one time by correlating them to each other as well as to "their true place in the universal system."[79]

This philosophical consideration does not exclude practical considerations, but does not focus centrally upon methods and skills which produce better preachers, sermons, or any product involved in the act of preaching.[80] Theological reflection therefore does not seek to accrue practical knowledge of preaching, but accurately to relate everything that is known of preaching, first to itself, and then to everything else in the Christian understanding of the world. The ultimate aim of theological reflection in homiletics, then, is to analyze,

---

77. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 116.

78. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 98.

79. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 99.

80. E.g. the hermeneutical process which creates the best content from which to preach, or the emotional experience of the congregation.

distribute, and harmonize what is known of preaching into a coherent intellectual structure which is itself aligned with a Christian understanding of all elements of the world and their corporate center in the Christian God.

Conclusion: What does theological reflection offer homiletics?

This chapter began by engaging the work of James Kay, who claims that North American homiletics has proceeded according to a rhetorical rather than theological frame of reference. After examination, Kay's work was found overly to imply a binary differentiation between the rhetorical frame of reference and the theological, but his general observation regarding the regnant role of rhetoric in North American homiletics was affirmed, particularly by observing the contemporary landscape of homiletical publications. This led to the central question of the chapter: what does theological reflection, though interspersed with rhetorical reflection, uniquely offer to homiletics?

The chapter offered an answer to this question by referring to two insights from John Henry Newman's *The Idea of a University*. The first, that theological reflection allowed for homiletics to grasp its ultimate grounds in the Christian God, was complemented by Thomas Torrance's concept of Christian contingency, and also yielded insight regarding the integrity and value of rhetorical reflection devoid of any theological consideration. The second, that education differed from instruction because it engendered philosophical reflection rather than practical engagement, noted that the majority of contemporary homiletical reflection is, understandably, concerned with instruction, not education, in preaching.

How, then, does theological reflection uniquely contribute to homiletics? The mind engaged in theological reflection in homiletics scrutinizes preaching in light of preaching's ultimate grounds in God, and constructs an understanding of preaching in relation to the rest of God's world. Theological reflection in preaching therefore does not merely aim to develop skills and methods, but moves towards referring all things in the act of preaching to "their true place in

the universal system, understanding their respective values, and determining their mutual dependence."[81]

The homiletician thinking theologically is functioning as a philosopher of preaching, whether such reflection lasts for a sentence, paragraph, or entire corpus of work. This move, wherein the homiletician lifts the eye from the act of preaching itself, with all its attendant methods and desired skills, and gazes also upon the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ creating and sustaining preaching, spans the divide between theological and rhetorical. This is a move from information to systematization, a move from enumerating discrete aspects to harmonizing the whole, a move from knowledge for memory to knowledge for philosophy. The theological homiletician is a philosopher of preaching who endeavors to observe it as an ordered whole in the sight of God.[82] Theological reflection in homiletics allows the homiletician to do this.

This understanding of theological reflection's role in homiletics does not aim to make rhetorical analyses merely a sub-category of theological analyses, a common occurrence which André Resner has called a reductionism which too quickly dismisses the "fundamental claims" of rhetoric.[83] In addition, this understanding of theological reflection's contribution to homiletics affirms the central insight of homileticians and theologians who have forwarded models of "theologically-authorized rhetoric," including James Kay, Charles Bartow, and Marjorie Suchocki.[84]

In summary, then, theological reflection uniquely opens the ability for homiletics to engage in an ongoing philosophical appraisal of the act of preaching; that is, it allows homileticians continually to reevaluate how preaching

---

81. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 99.

82. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 99f.

83. André Resner Jr., *Preacher and Cross: Person and Message in Theology and Rhetoric* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999) 137. He cites James E. Loder, "Theology and Psychology," in *Dictionary of Pastoral Care and Counseling*, ed. Rodney J. Hunter (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon, 1990) 1267.

84. Cf. James F. Kay's comments on these authors in *Preaching and Theology*, 144fn63.

intersects with the world, including the world's physical, moral, spiritual, and cultural aspects. Specifically and most importantly, it allows homiletics to propose how preaching fits into God's creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Jesus Christ, and thereby to justify homiletics' distinctly Christian character and mission.

Corresponding Implications and The Viceregal Homiletic

Based on this chapter's discussion, one proposal and two implications come into view regarding what theological reflection specifically offers to the contemporary state of North American homiletics. Taken together, these highlight the unique position of the viceregal homiletic in relation to existing homiletical reflection.

First, a proposal for how James Kay's initial statement, "rhetoric is the constant, theology the variable," is to be viewed in light of the insights subsequently gained from Newman and Torrance. The ubiquity in North America today of what we might call homiletical instruction, in contrast to homiletical education, corresponds with North American homiletics' favoring of the rhetorical mode of reflection. Rhetorical analyses and communication studies foster skills for preaching instead of imparting an intellectual process which analyzes, distributes, and harmonizes the widely variegated examples of preaching into a unified and systematic vision. In short, North American homiletics has concerned itself with training preachers, not philosophers of preaching. The reason, then, that rhetoric has held priority over theology is that instruction has held priority over education. Instruction has been the constant, and education the variable.

Two implications follow this proposal. First, as has been suggested, without theological reflection, homiletics cannot ultimately scrutinize the act of preaching. If a fundamental ability of any academic discipline is to grasp the object of its investigation, it is theological reflection which finally legitimizes homiletics as the discipline which scrutinizes the act of Christian preaching. Theological reflection grants an ability to grasp what Christian preaching is in its

entirety; it allows comprehension of preaching so that homiletics may describe, critique, and teach it.[85] The result of these dynamics is that, inasmuch as North American homiletics has ignored theological reflection as part of its mission, it has disallowed its work to be truly homiletical; it has mistaken general scrutiny of public speaking to be the scrutiny of Christian preaching.

A second observation follows the first. Without a sustained project of theological reflection, the discipline of homiletics lacks philosophical connectedness with the rest of the Christian intellectual tradition's witness to God's person and work, for it cannot see how its own tasks are connected to God's great acts of creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Jesus Christ. It therefore suffers from a profound and fundamental deficiency of self-understanding. Without theological reflection, sustained rhetorical reflection can only maintain this philosophical myopia; it can only gaze upon preaching itself, but cannot clearly discern the Christian God, nor preaching in terms of the Trinity's activity.[86]

These implications give context to the viceregal homiletic's unique position and promise for contemporary North American homiletics. Because the viceregal homiletic proceeds almost exclusively in a theological mode of reflection, it not only differs from the majority of contemporary homiletical reflection, but offers a needed remedy to contemporary homiletics' philosophical myopia.

Yet as this chapter has acknowledged, contemporary homiletics is not entirely devoid of theological reflection. How does the viceregal homiletic differ

---

85. Here, "comprehend" is used in contrast to "apprehend," the former term denoting a comprehensive understanding or grasp of something, and the latter denoting a genuine perception of something, though only in part.

86. William Atkinson, in his book *Trinity After Pentecost*, states that Pentecostals have become too pragmatic – particularly regarding academic attention to the Trinity. In response Atkinson suggests, citing Moltmann, that part of the Church's mission "is worship," and that therefore academic and technical descriptions of the Trinity fall within the Church's mission. William P. Atkinson, *Trinity After Pentecost* (Cambridge: Lutterworth, 2014) 4. Per this chapter's discussion, North American homiletics fits well under the same critique and suggestion.

from this existing theological reflection? To this question the following chapter will turn.

CHAPTER 2

Introduction

Contemporary homiletics uses theology in a variety of ways. Even a cursory glance at contemporary homiletical literature reveals a wide spectrum of reflection describing preaching in light of the person and work of the Christian God.

For some homileticians, God is given brief, yet important, mention in the midst of their projects. Take, for example, the work of Jay Adams. "Preaching," he writes, "necessarily involves: 1. Content...; 2. A preacher; 3. An occasion...; 4. Listeners; 5. The Holy Spirit." He then adds: "of course, the fifth element is most essential,"[1] though he scarcely mentions the Holy Spirit in the remainder of the book.[2] Adams thus acknowledges a unique role for the Holy Spirit, but the structure of his book minimizes and separates reflection on the Spirit from reflection on other "elements" of preaching.

On the other hand, Charles Bartow reflects on God's role in preaching in a way that synthetically joins theological insights with discussions of nearly all aspects of preaching. In the preface to *God's Human Speech*,[3] Bartow shares the theological questions at the heart of his homiletical reflection:

> Does God live, and has God lived among us as one of us? Is God's human speech after all incarnate? Does God have a name, a particular name, a divine name, a human name?...These are very practical questions and therefore not inappropriate for a very practical theologian to ask. So I ask them...For I cannot hope to find the living God if the living God has not found me, and I cannot preach the gospel of the living God if the living God has not spoken it to me. If

---

1. Jay E. Adams, *Preaching With Purpose: The Urgent Task of Homiletics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982) 7.

2. Cf. Jay E. Adams, *Preaching With Purpose*, 160, s.v. "Holy Spirit."

3. Charles L. Bartow, *God's Human Speech: A Practical Theology of Proclamation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997).

> God's speech is not human speech, truly human speech, then God might as well keep silent. Preachers might as well keep silent too.[4]

Bartow's words usher theological concepts into the homiletical discussion in a different manner than Adams's reflection. Rather than quarantining theological discussion to one chapter or passage of the work, Bartow's analysis converses with fundamental categories of Christian theology. He maintains this pattern of reflection throughout his book.[5]

Adams's and Bartow's theological reflection takes different forms. Adams draws from particular Scriptural texts and his theological reflection is, for the most part, separate from his other considerations of preaching. Bartow draws from a more comprehensive theological structure and his theological reflection, for the most part, runs throughout his consideration of preaching. These different forms of theological reflection move the discerning reader to wonder what other forms theological reflection takes in contemporary North American homiletics.

The discussions of the previous chapter served to differentiate rhetorical reflection from theological reflection in North American homiletics. They noted that the viceregal homiletic, because it proceeds from an almost exclusively theological mode, differs from the majority of contemporary homiletical reflection. Rather than merely examining the act of preaching in itself in order to accrue practical knowledge or skills, the viceregal homiletic, as a theological homiletic, seeks to examine preaching with God in view so as to build a philosophy of preaching.

Yet, as the previous chapter acknowledged, the viceregal homiletic is not alone in appraising preaching theologically; many homileticians today intersperse their rhetorical reflection with theological statements.[6] What remains to be

---

4. Charles L. Bartow, *God's Human Speech*, x.
5. E.g. Bartow's chapter 5: "What to Make of Sunday's Sermon," 125-148.
6. Cf. Chapter 1.

shown, then, is how the viceregal homiletic compares and contrasts with existing examples of theological reflection in homiletics. Demonstrating this is the purpose of this chapter. How does the viceregal homiletic, as a theological homiletic, differ from other theological homiletics?

Theological Modes of Homiletical Reflection

The following discussion will note three ways that contemporary homileticians bring theology to bear on their reflection by examining examples from each mode of theological reflection. The three modes examined are differentiated according to the concepts from which they choose to draw: (1) discrete insights from Scripture or theology, (2) a doctrine or doctrines from systematic theology, or (3) biblical theology. The chapter will note that each of these modes has strengths as well as deficiencies, and will view these in light of the viceregal homiletic.

The Insight-Theological Mode

The first group of homileticians reflects theologically by using discrete insights from Scripture and or theology to describe the act of preaching. For those drawing from Scripture, this method of theological appropriation values the wisdom of biblical studies as insights from Scriptural words, phrases, or pericopes are brought into the discussion of what preaching is.

This form of theological reflection is used by several evangelical homileticians, including Jay Adams, John MacArthur, and John Stott. Jay Adams, whose work was cited above, regularly utilizes this form of reflection. In his book *Preaching With Purpose*, Adams draws on New Testament word studies of various terms for preaching, as well as key verses concerning preaching.[7] John MacArthur's writing also regularly utilizes this form of reflection.[8] For example,

---

7. Jay E. Adams, *Preaching With Purpose*, 5-9.

8. John MacArthur, "The Mandate of Biblical Inerrancy: Expository Preaching," 22-35, "The Man of God and Expository Preaching," 85-101, "The Spirit of God and Expository Preaching," 102-115, in *Rediscovering Expository Preaching: John MacArthur, Jr. and the Master's Seminary Faculty*, ed. Richard L. Mayhue and Robert L. Thomas (Dallas, Texas: Word, 1992) 22-35, 85-115.

in a defense of word-by-word expository preaching, he draws from Proverbs 30:5, "every word of God is pure." He reflects that, "[i]f every word of God is pure, if every word of God is true, then every word needs to be dealt with. And expository preaching is the only way you actually come to grips with every word in the Scriptures."[9] MacArthur infers here that preaching is to be, in essence, a conveyance of the purity and truth found in every word of the Scriptural text. In a similar manner, John Stott's small book *A Preacher's Portrait* develops passages from Scripture, mostly Pauline, into images of a preacher as a Steward, Herald, Witness, Father, and Servant.[10]

These investigations are theological reflection because they reach beyond investigating the act of preaching by itself and instead view preaching in light of God's person and work. They do this by drawing directly from Scripture. This mode of theological reflection's key strength, therefore, is its seeking to remain close to Scripture's teaching.

Though this mode of theological reflection is not without weaknesses, these weaknesses have more to do with the form of this theological reflection than its content. Like others using the insight-theological mode of reflection,[11] Adams, MacArthur, and Stott do not offer a unified and comprehensive picture of what preaching is, but simply offer insights from Scripture on what preaching is.[12] Because it rests upon the choice of particular texts, and thus the exclusion of other texts, insight-theological analysis is incomplete from the vantage point of one seeking what the entire canon implies about the identity and function of a preacher today. Though each text selected throws light on what preaching is, the

---

9. John MacArthur, "Expository Preaching in a Postmodern World," *Grace to You*, accessed March 9, 2016, http://www.gty.org/resources/Articles/A152/Expository-Preaching-in-a-Postmodern-World-Part-1.

10. John R.W. Stott, *The Preacher's Portrait* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961) 9.

11. E.g. Wayne McDill, *12 Essential Skills for Great Preaching* (Nashville, Tennessee: B&H, 2006) esp. 189-198.

12. Stott probably overreaches when he claims that his book describes "a portrait painted by the hand of God Himself on the broad canvas of the New Testament." John R.W. Stott, *A Preacher's Portrait*, 7.

method suffers from what might be called a lack of consistent illumination. Like lightning illuminating the night for intermittent moments, the use of discrete insights throws flickering light upon the act of preaching, but cannot consistently sustain theological reflection upon preaching.

An additional question might be asked of this method: are the discrete words or texts chosen to describe preaching sufficient to describe preaching in its fullness? On this topic, Jason Meyer offers words of critique:

> …reducing preaching to what can be gleaned from word studies on "preaching words" can often result in committing the "word equals concept" fallacy. The flawed premise here is that the concept of preaching shows up only when the words for preaching are present…[T]here is nothing wrong with using a text to serve as a summary of preaching…However, if one relies on proof-texting too much, preaching loses its cumulative, holistic biblical meaning.[13]

Meyer's critique of the insight-theological mode is that collecting particular word studies or proof texts which refer directly to preaching does not give a complete picture of what all of Scripture says about preaching. This is accurate, for Scripture conveys insights that might inform homiletical reflection even though those particular insights apply indirectly to the act of preaching. For instance, Scripture teaches that all have sinned (Romans 3:23). This means that preachers are sinners – a relevant insight to integrate into any homiletical model. Though the canon does not contain the phrase "all preachers are sinners," the insight touches a basic component of the act of preaching: sinners carry it out.[14] Yet a theology of preaching merely aggregated from, to use Meyer's terminology, "preaching words" or proof texts will likely miss this point, and the resultant homiletical reflection will not be equipped to engage the concept of preachers as sinners from a robust canonical stance. In this way it becomes clearer why the flickering theological illumination given by discrete insights disallows a clear and sustained scrutiny of the act of preaching.

---

13. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching: A Biblical Theology* (Wheaton, Illinois: CrossWay, 2014) 316f.

14. Cf. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 287-291.

The work of Anna Florence exhibits some other deficiencies of this flickering. Take, for example, her reflection upon the "preacher as one out of your mind."[15] Florence bases her homiletical reflection on the Scripture when Rhoda hears Peter, who has been miraculously released from prison, at the gate. In Acts 12:14-15, she hears Peter, runs back to tell the disciples, and the disciples tell her she is out of her mind. From this passage, Florence extrapolates that, because the disciples did not believe Rhoda's message,

> …a preacher isn't the one who's most convincing; a preacher just has to be convinced herself…To preach, you can't be in your right mind. You have to be a little out of it, to be perfectly frank. Because there isn't anything that's going to dislocate you more than the grace of God.[16]

Here, Florence claims that preaching involves the preacher being personally convinced of the message and therefore "a little out of it" in comparison to the congregation. This insight does shed light on an important aspect of preaching, that preaching can function to bear witness to realities of which the congregation is unaware, and it is true that this function can cast the preacher into a stance of seeming irrational. This is not a comprehensive account of Christian preaching, and is not attempting to be; it simply offers an insight.

Thus, examples of insight-theological reflection drawing from Scriptural sources use discrete insights from Scripture as they discuss the act of preaching, and are often limited in their ability to scrutinize comprehensively the act of preaching. Next, we move on to the second kind of insight-theological reflection, one which draws from discrete theological insights.

A second kind of insight-theological reflection draws discrete theological insights into homiletics. This kind of theological appropriation brings individual insights about God or the world into the discussion of what preaching is.

---

15. Anna C. Florence, "Preacher as One 'Out of Your Mind,'" in *Slow of Speech and Unclean Lips: Contemporary Images of Preaching Identity* ed. Robert S. Reid (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2010) 144-153.

16. Anna C. Florence, "Preacher as One 'Out of Your Mind,'" 150f.

This form of theological reflection has been used by homileticians including Richard Lischer, Michael Pasquarello, and Peter Adam. Richard Lischer's book *A Theology of Preaching: Dynamics of the Gospel* discusses preaching in relation to theological ideas including law, gospel, resurrection, and the Church.[17] Lischer's work, both in this book and in his published Beecher lectures,[18] exhibits strong examples of theological reflection for homiletics which builds towards a philosophy of preaching rather than practical methods and skills.

Likewise, Michael Pasquarello's book *Christian Preaching: A Trinitarian Theology of Proclamation*,[19] consists of a collection of essays which are, in his words, "interrelated and overlapping," and which attempt to render a vision of the preacher "by means of an extended conversation regarding matters integral to preaching within the trinitarian grammar of faith confessed by the church."[20] Pasquarello's following chapters examine preaching from a variety of angles, including as theological practice, traditioned practice, and ecclesial practice.[21] Like Lischer, Pasquarello's grasp of theology's role in homiletics allows him to produce reflection which views preaching as a unified project in light of the Christian God's person and work.

Though both Lischer and Pasquarello's use of discrete theological insights enable a notable depth of homiletical insight in their work, their mode of theological reflection nevertheless suffers from certain weaknesses inherent in its form. By choosing to dialogue with certain insights from theology, these homileticians produce reflection that lacks overall internal unity. This is, in part, why their key works are much like collections of essays; each chapter pursues a

---

17. Richard Lischer, *A Theology of Preaching: Dynamics of the Gospel* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 1992) vii.

18. Richard Lischer, *The End of Words* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005).

19. Michael Pasquarello, *Christian Preaching: A Trinitarian Theology of Proclamation* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006).

20. Michael Pasquarello, *Christian Preaching*, 37.

21. Michael Pasquarello, *Christian Preaching*, 5.

salient question about preaching from a theological standpoint, but the overall book lacks a consistent, ongoing line of argument.[22]

Critique

Having surveyed examples of theological reflection in homiletics which draw from discrete insights both Scriptural and theological, it is now possible to make some observations about the insight-theological mode of homiletical reflection.

When homileticians use this mode of theological reflection, they infer that there is a broader body of knowledge about preaching which their reflection illuminates. Preaching, which already exists in the minds and experiences of these writers, is described in an aggregate manner by an accumulation of Scriptural or theological insights. This infers that the insight-theological mode sees preaching as having a substance in itself, such that various descriptions of it, proceeding from Scripture as well as the insights of existing theology, will elucidate parts of what that substance is. In other words, preaching has a substance or essence of its own. This is notable because the next mode of theological reflection discussed in this chapter, the systematic-theological mode, does not always acknowledge preaching as having a substance or reality unto itself, but infers that preaching exists in relation to larger projects of God.

But this positive implication of the insight-theological mode leads to what is perhaps its greatest shortcoming. When implying that a substance of preaching exists with which their observations intersect, the insight-theological modes reveal that their central intent is merely to produce discrete insights about preaching rather than a comprehensive account of preaching. They are therefore

---

22. A more thoroughgoing randomness of reflection marks the work of evangelical Peter Adam's *Speaking God's Words*, which, though filled with profitable insights about preaching, lacks, even on the chapter level, an internal coherence apart from being an accrual of wise theological insights on preaching. Peter Adam, *Speaking God's Words: A Practical Theology of Expository Preaching* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity, 1986) esp. 13-56. A similar pattern of reflection marks Abraham Kuruvilla's *A Vision for Preaching: Understanding the Heart of Pastoral Ministry* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015). For an article-length example of the same phenomenon, cf. R. Albert Mohler, "A Theology of Preaching," in *Handbook of Contemporary Preaching*, ed. Michael Duduit (Nashville, Tennessee: Broadman, 1992) 13-20.

satisfied to catch only glimpses of the substance of preaching by reflecting on isolated insights. They do not attempt to draw on the entire fabric of Scripture, Christian theology, and existing homiletical reflection to inform a comprehensive account. The insight-theological modes seem to depend upon this broader fabric of Scripture and Christian theology only so that they may cut individual pieces, discrete insights, out of it. The reflection they produce, therefore, seems to lack internal coherence.

An insight from theologian Richard Lints is helpful at this point. In his book *The Fabric of Theology*, Lints critiques the fragmented, disconnected nature of contemporary theology, writing that "there is no pattern that holds the quilt together overall, other than its diversity."[23] This fragmentation is itself a result of a fundamental misperception of Scripture's unity of message.[24] Scripture, Lints claims, exhibits an inherent unity of structure and message. Because of this, theological reflection should also cohere as an organic, ideological whole in a manner which mirrors Scripture itself.[25] Rather than consisting of various Scriptural images of God or of uncoordinated groups of Scriptural data, Lints claims that a theology faithful to Christian Scripture will offer a unified understanding of God derived from the totality of the Scriptural witness.

Lints writes, "It is important to ask seriously whether the conception of doing theology by stringing together Christian doctrines like pearls in a necklace might not be undermining the essential unity of the biblical message."[26] It is this insight that touches the shortcoming of the insight-theological mode for homiletics. The question which this insight-theological mode of reflection raises is whether the conception of doing homiletical reflection by stringing together

---

23. Richard Lints, *The Fabric of Theology: A Prolegomenon to Evangelical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993) 261.

24. Richard Lints, *The Fabric of Theology*, 261.

25. Richard Lints, *The Fabric of Theology*, 261.

26. Richard Lints, *The Fabric of Theology*, 261.

discrete ideas about preaching "like pearls in a necklace" might not undercut an essential unity in what Scripture communicates about the act of preaching.

In contrast to an insight-theological mode, the viceregal homiletic begins from a unified, Christian understanding of canonical revelation before reflecting on the canon's insights into Christian preaching. Such homiletical reflection is not merely interested in stockpiling discrete Scriptural insights about preaching, but works to see how Scripture itself teaches and implies that these insights fit together into a coherent whole. To return to the idea that preaching has an essence or substance of its own, a viceregal homiletic aims to grasp and scrutinize the substance of preaching by drawing on the entire canon as well as the Christian theological tradition in order to bring together their insights in a coherent and comprehensive manner. This homiletic therefore draws the discrete insights of word-studies, texts, and theology into a broader project attempting to discern and describe preaching comprehensively.

The Systematic-Theological Mode

The second way contemporary homiletical reflection brings theology to bear on its task is by using doctrines from systematic theology to describe the act of preaching. This method of theological appropriation, here referred to as the systematic-theological mode, represents engagement with theological insights which are more systematized and interrelated than discrete insights. This kind of homiletical reflection has significant historical precedents, including the Protestant reformers Martin Luther and John Calvin. Ongoing retrievals of ideas from these and other past writers as well as new proposals about preaching based on revisionist understandings of Christian theology mark North American contemporary homiletical reflection in the systematic-theological mode.

Homiletics in the systematic-theological mode regularly produces reflection rich in Scriptural and theological insights suitable to penetrate to the substance of preaching. For example, Gerhard Forde, following Martin Luther, reflects upon the preacher's identity in light of God's ongoing act of revealing

himself.[27] Differentiating "God preached" from "God not preached," Luther claimed that unless God is clothed in the words and actions of the Church, he remains hidden, and can only cause terror and confusion. In *The Bondage of the Will*, Luther writes, "we have to argue in one way about God or the will of God as preached, revealed, offered, and worshipped, and in another way about God as he is not preached, not offered, not worshiped."[28] Based on this, Forde asserts that abstract theological observations about God can only present God, "hidden in his own majesty,"[29] and implies that the proclamation of the gospel is contingent upon the message being brought from human to human. Only therein is the gospel seen as good news and not terrifying law. Forde writes, "The problem is that when we think 'God' we come up against an awesome string of sheer abstractions, what Luther meant, perhaps, by the 'naked God in his majesty'."[30] The central way God approaches us is in proclamation, wherein God becomes clothed in flesh.[31]

Forde's analysis penetrates directly to the question of what the act of preaching is in its essence, and therefore, also, to what the preacher is in essence. Preaching is, in Forde's work, a component part of God revealing himself, moreso, of God revealing himself as grace, mercy, and love, not sheer, terrifying law. The humanity of the preacher is integral in Forde's systematic-theological account, not merely an accidental characteristic of the act.

In systematic perspective, Forde, via Luther, reflects on preaching in relation to the doctrines of salvation and revelation, therein locating its essence and importance. With similar levels of insight and complexity, Ronald Wallace's

---

27. Forde develops the passage on preaching from Luther's *Bondage of the Will* in *The Preached God*, Mark C. Mattes and Steven D. Paulson, eds. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007) 48-55; and *Theology is for Proclamation* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 1990) 13-20.

28. Martin Luther, *Luther's Works* [American Edition], 55 vols. (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress, 1955-1986) 33:139.

29. *Luther's Works*, 33:140.

30. Gerhard O. Forde, *Theology is for Proclamation* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 1990) 15.

31. Gerhard O. Forde, *Theology is for Proclamation*, 21-22.

appropriation of John Calvin's work describes the place and function of preaching in terms of Christ's exaltation.[32] These insights penetrate beyond merely saying, for example, that the content of the sermon is coming from God because Scripture is pure,[33] and in doing so differs in form from the insight-theological mode which draws directly from Scriptural texts.

During the last one hundred years, homileticians have revisited these Reformational patterns with a revised understanding of the doctrine of revelation. For example, the work of Marjorie Suchocki, in which preaching brings the whispered word of God to a focused shout,[34] forwards a view of revelation rooted more in the process philosophy of Alfred Whitehead than the understanding of revelation held by either Calvin or Luther.[35] Other contemporary revisionist examples of homiletics from the systematic-theological mode include the work of James Kay, appropriating Rudolf Bultmann's Christology.[36] Kay writes that Bultmann viewed preaching as the only touch point between Christ and the contemporary world.[37] For Bultmann, preaching itself was Christ's incarnation, resurrection, and Second Coming: "In the preached word, and only in it, is the Risen One encountered."[38] In this, Bultmann relocates all revelatory potential of Jesus to the contemporary act of preaching. "Thus preaching is an eschatological

---

32. Cf. Ronald S. Wallace, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament* (Tyler, Texas: Geneva Divinity School, 1982) 82-95.

33. Cf. John MacArthur, "Expository Preaching in a Postmodern World," accessed March 9, 2016, http://www.gty.org/resources/Articles/A152/Expository-Preaching-in-a-Postmodern-World-Part-1.

34. Marjorie H Suchocki, *The Whispered Word: A Theology of Preaching* (St. Louis, Missouri: Chalice, 1999) esp. 1-12, 19.

35. Cf. Donald K. McKim, *The Bible in Theology and Preaching* (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon, 1985) esp. 115-124, "Process Theology," which concludes with a sermon by Suchocki.

36. James F. Kay, *Christus Praesens: A Reconsideration of Rudolf Bultmann's Christology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994).

37. James F. Kay, *Christus Praesens*, 77.

38. "Neues Testament und Mythologie: Das Problem der Entmythologisierung der neutestamentlichen Verkundigung [1941]," in Hans Werner Bartsch, ed., *Kerygma und Mythos: Ein theologisches Gesprach* (Hamburg: Reich & Heidrich, 1948) 51, trans. and quoted in James F. Kay, *Christus Praesens*, 90.

event, a salvation occurrence which is 'nowhere present except in the proclaiming, accosting, demanding, and promising word of preaching.'"[39]

Kay asserts that Bultmann's theology is particularly fecund for homiletical reflection:

> Bultmann's work [possesses] such perennial prospects [because] no other theology in this century provides such a magisterial understanding of preaching as the primary locus of Christ's presence in the world. [For Bultmann,] Christ is our contemporary…Christ presides over our time, and every time, from his place in the pulpit.[40]

Kay's investigation of Bultmann is clear and helpful in its description, but fails to critique adequately Bultmann's departure from historic Christian orthodoxy. Bultmann's homiletical reflection overtly denies the creedal affirmations of Christ's resurrection and Second Coming[41] and reassigns the significance of these events to the function of the sermon. Despite Bultmann's departure from Christian orthodoxy, Kay's work illustrates the strength of the systematic-theological mode of reflection for homiletics.

Critique

The above examples illustrate that the systematic-theological mode describes the act of preaching as it is seen in proximity to doctrines central to the Christian faith. Rather than choosing discrete insights as in the insight-theological modes, homileticians writing in a systematic-theological mode are able to bring significant insights from both Scripture and Christian theology to bear on describing the act of preaching. This mode of reflection relies and builds upon the systematizing and aggregating work of Christian theologians, and therefore avoids the somewhat random accrual of insights which can mark insight-theological reflection. It is therefore better equipped to honor the essential unity

---

39. John W. Beaudean, *Paul's Theology of Preaching*, 9, citing Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, vol. 1 (New York: Scribner, 1951-1955) 301.

40. James F. Kay, *Christus Praesens*, 176.

41. From the Apostles' Creed, "On the third day he rose again from the dead. He ascended into heaven and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty. From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

of Christian Scripture's message as it draws on Scripture to inform homiletical reflection.

Secondly, because it transacts its homiletical reflection according to existing, developed bodies of Christian doctrine, the systematic-theological mode habitually centralizes ideas from Scripture and Christian theology which are ideologically broader than the act of preaching itself. It thus possesses a descriptive potential which transcends the usual abilities of the insight-theological modes. Returning to the analogy of the insight-theological mode viewing preaching through flickering light, in comparison, the systematic mode of reflection offers a more consistent source of light. This allows homiletics to view preaching in a sustained manner from various angles, while also illuminating other phenomena near which the act of preaching exists. The insight-theological mode aims to describe the act of preaching in relation to God through the intermittent light of discrete insights. The systematic-theological mode aims to describe preaching in relation to God as well as how preaching interfaces with other areas of God's creation through the more consistent light of systematic doctrinal syntheses of Scripture.

But this strength is directly related to the defining weakness of the systematic-theological mode. Because it transacts its reflection by scrutinizing the act of preaching in the light of existing categories of theological reflection, any systematic-theological reflection on preaching is defined by the quality and priorities of the theology with which it chooses to dialogue.

For example, homiletical reflection performed in concert with revisionist Christian theology has a tendency to produce new understandings of the act of preaching, some of which sharply diverge from any historical Christian understanding. As already mentioned, James Kay's appropriation of Rudolf Bultmann's description of the act of preaching as the incarnation, resurrection, and Second Coming of Jesus Christ is one example of this dynamic at play. According to Bultmann's systematic-theological reflection, preaching is not an

exposition or proclamation of Scripture with its historical particularities intact, but the birth and second advent of Jesus, manifested through a proclamation of a dehistoricized, demythologized "gospel" aimed to invoke an existential encounter with Christ.

Likewise, Doug Pagitt's *Preaching Reimagined*[42] also forwards a revised understanding of the act of preaching. Pagitt reinterprets preaching in light of what he sees to be the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers.[43] For Pagitt, preaching involves no authoritative exposition or proclamation of Scripture's message, but the reading of a Scripture followed by unguided conversation and comments from the gathered congregation. This revision of the act of preaching proceeds from Pagitt's choice that the priesthood of all believers should govern the act of preaching.[44]

Thus, we see that systematic-theological reflection in homiletics is linked directly to the quality and priorities of the theology with which the homiletician chooses to dialogue. In the work of Kay and Pagitt, this leads to reinterpretations of the act of preaching which diverge from a traditional understanding. Yet even among homileticians who do not seek to revise the basic identity or function of preaching, the systematic-theological frame can influence the vision of preaching in significant ways.

One example of such an influence is present in Bryan Chapell's *Christ-Centered Preaching*.[45] Chapell's work posits that all Scripture, and therefore all preaching, is redemptive in character and intent. A sermon therefore "(1) focuses on the fallen condition that necessitated the writing of the passage and (2) uses the text's features to explain how the Holy Spirit addresses that concern then and

---

42. Doug Pagitt, *Preaching Re-Imagined: The Role of the Sermon in Communities of Faith* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005).

43. Doug Pagitt, *Preaching Re-Imaginged*, 152f.

44. Doug Pagitt, *Preaching Re-Imaginged*, 152f.

45. Bryan Chapell, *Christ-Centered Preaching* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005).

now."[46] Preaching is reparative and redemptive; in systematic-theological perspective, Chapell views preaching in the light of the doctrine of redemption.

The choice to describe preaching in light of the doctrine of redemption grants remarkable strength and fecundity to the work of Chapell, as well as others who write from a systematic-theological mode centering on redemption.[47] However, Chapell's homiletical reflection raises the question of whether Scripture's intent is only always redemptive. Does Scripture not sometimes simply inform, with no immediate aim of redemption?[48] Abraham Kuruvilla has raised salient questions regarding whether Chapell's method, and other homiletical methods which require every sermon to return to Jesus Christ, adequately perceive that Scripture also contains examples of what Kuruvilla terms "divine demand."[49] If Kuruvilla's critique is right, it has found an example of how seeing preaching only in the light of redemption limits homiletics' ability to describe how preaching may function. Redemption-focused homiletics cannot adequately account for preaching functioning simply to inform congregants of what moral choices God expects of believers or humanity in general.[50] In this way, Chapell's view of preaching through the lens of redemption may overemphasize the salvific function of preaching, while also obscuring part of what preaching has historically functioned to do: simply announce the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Thus, though Chapell's work does not proceed from a revisionist position, it is nevertheless an example of the systematic-theological mode's tendency to recast preaching according to priorities of the doctrine in light of which preaching is viewed. In this, the overall effect of the systematic-theological mode

---

46. Bryan Chapell, *Christ-Centered Preaching*, 50.

47. E.g. Timothy Keller, *Preaching: Communicating Faith in an Age of Skepticism* (New York: Viking, 2015). Cf. Paul S. Wilson, *Preaching and Homiletical Theory* (Louisville, Kentucky: Chalice, 2004) 73-100.

48. E.g. Isaiah 6:8-13.

49. Abraham Kuruvilla, *Privilege the Text!*, 242-247.

50. E.g., if they are taken as examples of preaching, Jonah's message to Nineveh (Jonah 3:4) or Obadiah's prophecy against Edom (Obadiah).

of reflection is somewhat like the effect on someone wearing a set of clothes that were tailored for someone else. Though perhaps skillfully made of high-quality cloth, the clothes are tight in some areas and loose in others. The fit is a bit unshapely. This is perhaps because, though systematic or doctrinal articulations of Scriptural truth generally fit the body of homiletics, many such articulations were tailored for other purposes or situations.[51] As a result, the systematic-theological mode regularly compels homiletical reflection to fit into ideological areas tailored for other situations.

The systematic theology drawn into homiletics relates to another deficiency of the systematic-theological mode of homiletical reflection. Whereas the insight-theological modes regularly infer that preaching has a substance and reality of its own, the systematic-theological mode has a tendency to view preaching only in the light of broader ideas and projects of God. To return to the analogy of illumination, it seems that the light thrown upon preaching by systematic-theological reflection is indirect light, ambient light left over from focusing upon other works and attributes of God. While these other acts of God may be important to acknowledge, homiletics invites a more focused illumination of the act of preaching. If homiletics is the academic discipline which focuses on

---

51. Since 1985, a particularly fecund body of homiletical reflection in the systematic-theological mode has proceeded by viewing preaching in light of ecclesiology. E.g. Charles Campbell, *Preaching Jesus: The New Directions for Homiletics in Hans Frei's Postliberal Theology* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock, 2006); Walter Brueggemann, *Finally Comes the Poet: Daring Speech for Proclamation* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress, 1989); idem, *Texts Under Negotiation: The Bible and Postmodern Imagination* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress, 1993); idem, *The Practice of Prophetic Imagination: Preaching an Emancipating Word* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress, 2012); Donald English, *An Evangelical Theology of Preaching* (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon, 1996), esp. 33-44, "Chapter 3: Doctrine as a Rhythm for Life"; John W. Wright, *Telling God's Story: Narrative Preaching for Christian Formation* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity, 2007); Mark Ellingsen, *The Integrity of Biblical Narrative: Story in Theology and Proclamation* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress, 1980); William H. Willimon, *Peculiar Speech: Preaching to the Baptized* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992); idem, *The Intrusive Word: Preaching to the Unbaptized* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994); Ronald J. Allen, Barbara S. Blaisdell, and Scott B. Johnston, *Theology for Preaching: Authority, Truth, and Knowledge of God in a Postmodern Ethos* (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon, 1997); Michael Schmaus, *Preaching as a Saving Encounter* (Staten Island, New York: Alba House, 1966) 65-78; Joseph Ratzinger, *Dogma and Preaching: Applying Christian Doctrine to Daily Life* (San Francisco, California: Ignatius, 2011).

the act of preaching itself, it seems better served by theological content that directly illumines the act of preaching.

The viceregal homiletic attempts to offer a comprehensive theological structure built to illumine the act of preaching directly. As will be described in the following chapter, the viceregal homiletic has integrity in itself because it is constructed upon existing projects of historical-critical exegesis, biblical theology, and systematic theology, but nevertheless represents a fresh articulation of Scripture's teaching formulated with homiletics in mind. Inasmuch as it is successful in this endeavor, it mitigates the deficiencies of the systematic-theological mode of reflection while retaining its strengths.

The Biblical-Theological Mode

The third way contemporary homiletical reflection brings theology to bear on its task is by using biblical theology to describe the act of preaching. This mode of theological reflection proceeds according to the progression of the canonical narrative. Jason Meyer's *Preaching: A Biblical Theology*, which builds upon earlier scholars' work in the area of biblical theology and preaching,[52] illustrates this mode of theological reflection in homiletics. Meyer's work is indebted to Geerhardus Vos's *Biblical Theology*,[53] for in it Meyer traces preaching, or what he terms the "stewardship of God's word,"[54] through successive eras of redemptive history, showing its historic continuity as well as the multiple forms it takes in the

---

52. E.g. Graeme Goldsworthy, *Preaching the Whole Bible as Christian Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) esp. 31-45; Sidney Greidanus, *The Modern Preacher and the Ancient Text: Interpreting and Preaching Biblical Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988); Edmund P. Clowney, *Preaching and Biblical Theology* (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: P&R, 2002); idem, *Preaching Christ in All of Scripture* (Wheaton, Illinois: CrossWay, 2003). These predecessors of Meyer observe preaching biblically-theologically in order to describe the present task of preaching, and particularly the interpretation of Scripture. Meyer's work does have some of these practical ends in mind, yet is more concerned with probing the canon for examples of prior preaching. Said differently, Meyer's work tends more directly in the direction of homiletical reflection rather than in the direction of improving or delineating the practice of Christian preaching.

53. Geerhardus Vos, *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948). See also *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation: the Shorter Writings of Geerhardus Vos*, ed. Richard B. Gaffin (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980).

54. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 75-236.

canon.[55] Meyer's reflection on preaching therefore seems poised to observe how occurrences of preaching in particular biblical stories develop former manifestations of preaching and prefigure later manifestations. In this, Meyer follows Vos's articulation of the goal of biblical theology: "nothing else than the exhibition of the organic process of supernatural revelation in its historic continuity and multiformity."[56] Echoing Vos, Meyer explains his own method of homiletical reflection:

> Within the storyline of Scripture, we can unpack the concept of preaching in an organic way in direct relation to the unfolding of divine revelation. We must keep this vital relationship between the storyline of Scripture and the concept of preaching clearly in view or preaching will lose its biblical bearings and its center of gravity.[57]

Meyer rightly insists that insights on preaching removed from the context of the storyline of Scripture will create a faulty theology of preaching. This is why Meyer, like other homileticians writing from the biblical-theological mode,[58] is not interested merely in collecting Scriptural insights, but in correctly arranging insights from Scripture according to their place in the canon and viewing them within that context.

Meyer arranges his book accordingly. He traces what he calls the "stewarding and heralding of God's word" through ten sequential eras of the canonical story, drawing what he terms "paradigms" from each.[59] He then posits the theological importance of expository preaching, and concludes the theological

---

55. This description echoes Vos's definition of biblical theology.

56. Geerhardus Vos, "The Idea of Biblical Theology," in *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation: the Shorter Writings of Geerhardus Vos*, ed. Richard B. Gaffin (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980) 15.

57. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 318. Note also Meyer's use of the term "organic," a key term throughout Vos's descriptions of biblical theology, e.g. Geerhardus Vos, "The Idea of Biblical Theology," 15.

58. Edmund P. Clowney, *Preaching and Biblical Theology*; also *Preaching Christ in All of Scripture*.

59. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 75-236.

investigation of the book with what he calls "soundings from systematic theology."[60]

Critique

The biblical-theological mode represents a more developed mode than the insight-theological mode, for it aims to retain the structure of the Scriptural witness as it examines the act of preaching in successive eras of the canonical narrative. In this, it differs from the systematic-theological mode of reflection, which purposefully rearranges Scriptural insights in its development of doctrines and systematization of Scriptural content.

Jason Meyer's division of the "stewardship of God's word" into ten era-based paradigms seems uncritically posited, though his account is clearly an attempt to show how preaching unfolds in an organic way in relation to the progression of the Scriptural narrative. His work therefore exhibits an inherent strength of biblical-theological reflection for homiletics.

Earlier in this chapter, the insight-theological mode section noted Meyer's critique of basing homiletics merely on word studies or isolated texts. Meyer's grasp of the insufficiency of proof texts to inform a comprehensive theological mode for preaching is also helpful in differentiating the biblical-theological mode from the insight-theological mode. He writes that homiletics based solely on word studies misunderstands the nature of Scripture:

> [T]hese shortcuts treat the Bible as if it were a textbook on preaching, which it is not. God has not given us a manual or "how to" book on preaching. He has given us a story. If we are ever to understand preaching, we have to examine what it is and what role it has played within the contours of that story…Within the storyline of Scripture, we can unpack the concept of preaching in an organic way in direct relation to the unfolding of divine revelation.[61]

---

60. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 283-297.

61. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 318.

Thus, the biblical-theological mode not only seeks out discrete insights in the canon that elucidate what preaching is, but does so while tracing how those insights progress and build upon one another through the canon. In this way, the biblical-theological mode is able to trace out how the concept of preaching has developed through sequential eras of redemptive history. Meyer is right to point this out.

In addition, however, biblical-theological reflection on preaching presupposes that preaching has its own reality and substance which manifests in multiform ways during different eras of canonical history. The biblical-theological task of tracing out how redemptive history unfolds therefore aims to give a customized theological account of the substance of preaching, particularly by noting similarities and differences in preaching from epoch to epoch. Unlike the systematic-theological mode, which recycles doctrinal concepts in order to reflect on preaching, biblical-theological reflection creates a tailored theological account from which to scrutinize the substance of preaching. This is theology about preaching and for the benefit of homiletics rather than theology used to describe preaching in terms of other Christian phenomena.

Meyer's work within the biblical-theological mode of reflection does leave some questions unanswered. First, while it seems that Meyer's descriptions of preaching in different eras of biblical history are accurate, the jump from the New Testament era to the present presents more problems than Meyer's discussion implies. What remains somewhat unclear is whether Meyer ultimately views contemporary preaching as an extension of a post-apostolic "pastoral" paradigm or as something of a conglomerate of all ten eras which he identifies. While he states that today's examples of preaching fall under the "stewardship of the pastor,"[62] he also makes general observations regarding preaching in each of the ten eras. It is unclear whether these general observations all apply to preaching today, or whether they describe only the preaching during former eras.

---

62. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 222-234.

For example, during what Meyer calls the era "of the psalmists and the scribes,"[63] Meyer notes that the psalmists found delight in the law of the Lord. He then infers that preaching brings delight to preachers today.[64] But, one might ask, if today is the pastoral era, does this delight really apply to preachers today? Based on the general tenor of Meyer's discussion, it seems clear that he does believe that preaching today brings delight to the preacher, but his use of the biblical-theological method could be clearer here.[65]

Critiquing Meyer on this issue may seem superficial, but the point surfaces a broader, second deficiency in Meyer's homiletical reflection. With a few exceptions, Meyer does not synthesize his findings into clear statements about preaching today. Though his argument for expository preaching builds generally upon Scriptural insights, some of which his prior survey of the canon had found, his final plea for expository preaching lacks a thorough and direct connection with the canonical survey. It seems that Meyer's case for expository preaching is actually just an assertion, an assertion which occurs after a noble presentation of Scriptural insights about preaching arranged in canonical order. Rather than being an account of how the canon progressively reveals what preaching is, Meyer's discussion presents significant Scriptural data regarding preaching, but lacks an ongoing synthesis of those insights. The entire discussion, therefore, does not necessarily support his assertion that expository preaching is the only right option for "stewarding and heralding God's word" today.

In this matter, theologian Richard Lints again offers helpful insight. Lints notes that the progression of revelation through the Christian canon not only accrues more biblical knowledge, but serves to develop a holistic theological lens through which to view creation. Lints terms this the canon's development of a

---

63. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 160-175.

64. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 164-167.

65. In addition, if he sees preaching today as an extension of the "pastoral" era, Meyer might have offered more justification for why today's preaching takes significantly different forms than the recorded sermons of the apostles and the earliest non-canonical Christian writings, e.g. *The Shepherd of Hermes*.

"theological vision."[66] Scripture views history theologically; historical narratives in Scripture focus on telling history as a rehearsal of God's previous activity, while prophetic visions of future history see God's future redemption as repetitions of his acts of old.[67] A theological vision rooted in the canon's theological framework will thus view contemporary history through a distinctly theological lens, viewing history today in light of God's previous activity and his promised future activity.

With this insight in view, it seems that Meyer's work lacks the development of a theological vision for contemporary preaching. Meyer's book, figuratively speaking, assembles all the ingredients, but does not complete the recipe. How is Christian preaching today a repetition of God's previous activity? How will God's future redemption in regards to Christian preaching mirror his acts of old? Though Meyer's biblical-theological mode of reflection seems poised to offer answers to these questions, his work does not fully pursue them.

In contrast, the viceregal homiletic surveys Scripture so as to synthesize and sum up the results of its biblical theology into a unified understanding of what Scripture says about Christian preaching. In this way it aims to produce what Lints calls a "theological vision" through which to view contemporary Christian preaching. The viceregal homiletic is thus able to surpass existing biblical-theological reflection on Christian preaching and reflect explicitly on what Christian preaching is in the contemporary world, aligning contemporary Christian preaching with both the redemption of the past and God's promised future.[68]

---

66. Richard Lints, *The Fabric of Theology*, 261. A theological vision must "mirror the structure of Scripture."

67. "History was recorded because history could be repeated…according to the principle that the past acts of God provided the hope that he would continue to be faithful…" Richard Lints, *The Fabric of Theology*, 269.

68. Chapters 4 and 5 of this thesis develop further these statements.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter has been to differentiate the viceregal homiletic from other modes of theological reflection used in contemporary homiletics in North America. By examining contemporary examples of theological reflection in homiletics, the chapter surveyed three modes of theological reflection, outlining some of their strengths and deficiencies and differentiating them from the viceregal homiletic.

The insight-theological mode reflects on preaching using discrete insights from Scripture or theology. The works of John MacArthur, John Stott, Anna Florence, and Jay Adams were presented as examples of insight-theological appropriation of discrete Scriptural insights. Though this kind of theological reflection aims to remain close to the teaching of Scripture, it was observed that it does not attempt consistently to produce a comprehensive appraisal of the act of preaching. This is partly due to its form of reflection, wherein discrete insights are grouped together without clear structure, but also due to its reliance upon word studies, which can skew its appraisal of preaching towards what the canon only says directly about preaching.

The works of Richard Lischer, Michael Pasquarello, and Peter Adam were presented as examples of insight-theological appropriation which brings discrete theological ideas into homiletics. The depth of engagement exhibited by this kind of insight-theological reflection was noted, but again, due to its form of reflection, this mode was observed to lack an internal unity. Here, Richard Lints's work suggested that simply accruing insights from Scripture or theology about preaching may create an understanding of preaching which undercuts its essential unity. In this way, then, the insight-theological modes may belie a misunderstanding of the nature of Christian Scripture, which itself presents an essentially unified view of the world.

The works of Gerhard Forde, Marjorie Suchocki, James Kay, and Bryan Chapell were presented as examples of the systematic-theological mode of

reflection in homiletics. The systematic-theological mode, though fecund and potent to describe aspects of preaching, was observed to be dependent upon the quality and the priorities of the theology with which the homiletician chose to dialogue. Revisionist examples of Christian theology were demonstrated to produce understandings of the act of preaching which can diverge from what the Church has historically believed and practiced. In addition, the systematic-theological mode was found simply to reuse previously existing theology to describe preaching, rather than producing theological content specifically to describe what contemporary preaching is.

The biblical-theological mode of reflection was found to produce canonically-attuned insights into the act of preaching. Here, the work of Jason Meyer was engaged, noting that it accrued and canonically arranged insights about preaching, but lacked a clear overall synthesis of what Scripture implies regarding preaching. It therefore was unable to offer an appraisal of contemporary preaching in light of redemptive history both past and future.

To summarize, then, theological reflection in contemporary homiletics is both varied and fecund, yet struggles to offer a theological account of Christian preaching which synthetically reflects both the entirety and the unity of the Christian canon, and brings that account coherently to bear upon contemporary preaching. To return to the words of Richard Lints, contemporary homiletics lacks a "theological vision" of contemporary preaching; that is, a view of contemporary preaching informed by the entirety of Scripture's development.[69] Such a theological vision for homiletics would illuminate preaching in a direct and sustained manner while also noting its proximity to God's greater acts, past and future, of creation, redemption, and consummation in Jesus Christ.

In contrast to the contemporary homiletical reflection surveyed in this chapter, the viceregal homiletic's use of biblical theology strives for this kind of synthesis of the Scriptural witness on preaching. In this process, the viceregal

69. Richard Lints, *Fabric of Theology*, 261.

homiletic pursues the ideological precursor of Christian preaching; that is, it attempts to construct the uncreated divine idea which precedes and informs all acts of Christian preaching, and then to bring this to bear on its reflection on contemporary preaching.

In this way, the viceregal homiletic is a project in, to use John Newman's words, pushing preaching up to its first principles and locating its "true place in the universal system," understanding its value and determining its mutual dependencies.[70] In this, it attempts to offer a philosophy of Christian preaching relevant for contemporary homiletics in a manner distinct from existing North American theological reflection for homiletics.

70. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 99.

CHAPTER 3

Introduction

The prior two chapters have

through both implicit and explicit statements, asserted that the viceregal homiletic possesses these characteristics:

1) The viceregal homiletic reflects theologically on preaching; that is, it considers preaching with the Christian God in view in order to describe preaching within the ordered structures of creation.

2) The viceregal homiletic pursues preaching directly, not indirectly via other insights or systematic doctrines. It assumes that preaching possesses importance and integrity sufficient to warrant customized consideration.

3) The viceregal homiletic proceeds biblical-theologically; however, in contrast to at least one existing biblical-theological homiletic, the viceregal homiletic extends the biblical-theological process to create a theological vision through which to view preaching in the contemporary and future worlds, not merely in the past.

Taken together, these three characteristics encapsulate the viceregal homiletic's uniqueness in comparison to recent homiletical reflection in North America.

Purpose of This Chapter

This chapter will begin to demonstrate that the biblical-theological work, particularly the biblical-theological method, of Gregory K. Beale[1] aligns with and

1. Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011); Beale, *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999); Beale, ed., *The Right Doctrine From the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1994); Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers

enhances the viceregal homiletic in these areas of uniqueness. The chapter will summarize Beale's method and probe it by differentiating it with other biblical theologies. The chapter will make a key suggestion regarding the nature of Beale's work in comparison to the work of Brevard Childs. Finally, our discussion will revisit the three areas of the viceregal homiletic's uniqueness in order to summarize how Beale's method for biblical theology aligns with each of them.

Gregory K. Beale

Biography

Gregory K. Beale is currently the J. Gresham Machen Chair and Professor of New Testament and Biblical Theology at Westminster Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. He taught previously at Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary in South Hamilton, Massachusetts and Wheaton Graduate School in Wheaton, Illinois. His Doctor of Philosophy is from the University of Cambridge, U.K., in the area of Hebrew and Greek exegesis.[2] To date, Beale's publications include over sixteen books and fifty articles, most in the areas of biblical interpretation and biblical theology.[3]

A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New

This chapter's engagement with Beale's work will draw mainly from his 2011 book, *A New Testament Biblical Theology*,[4] for it represents his most complete work of biblical theology, incorporating his earlier works in biblical

---

Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity, 2004); Beale, *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Academic, 2008).

2. "Gregory K. Beale," Faculty, Westminster Theological Seminary, accessed July 23, 2018, http://faculty.wts.edu/faculty/beale/.

3. "Resume of Gregory K. Beale's Academic and Ministerial Background," accessed July 23, 2018, http://faculty.wts.edu/wp-content/uploads/2015/05/Beale-revisedCV.pdf.

4. Gregory K. Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011). Hereafter cited as "*NTBT*."

interpretation.[5] "This book represents the biblical-theological thought that I have been developing for about thirty years in various articles and books…"[6] It will therefore be taken as a paradigmatic and comprehensive snapshot of Beale's theological method and reflection. Additionally, to an extent untouched by his other works Beale's *A New Testament Biblical Theology* develops his reading of the Adam and Eve narrative as informative of Christ's reign and the Church's contemporary ministry.[7] This reading of Adamic themes into Christ's reign and the Church's contemporary ministry is an integral facet of the viceregal homiletic.

An overview of Beale's method will now begin to demonstrate his uniqueness among New Testament theologians, and will set the stage for showing its influence upon the viceregal homiletic.

Method

Beale's *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* differs from other New Testament theologies and biblical theologies.[8] Though the complexity of these differences makes a comprehensive comparison and contrast of Beale vis-à-vis other New Testament theologians nearly impossible, Beale's project could be described as uniquely observing how the New Testament continues the Old Testament's storyline.[9] This is implied by the subtitle of the work, "the unfolding of the Old Testament in the New," and manifests in several ways, most notably a nuanced view of the relationship of the Old and New Testaments, as well as a heavy use of intertestamental

---

5. Editor of *Right Doctrine From Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994); *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation*, Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 166 (Sheffield: JSOld Testament, 1998); Co-editor with D. A. Carson, *A Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*, (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007); *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012).

6. Beale, *NTBT*, 24.

7. Cf. Beale, *NTBT*, 23.

8. Cf. Beale, *NTBT*, 1-26.

9. Beale, *NTBT*, 6.

intertextuality. This discussion of Beale's method will touch on both of these facets in a moment.

Beale's project traces themes by monitoring their canonical development, a method which generally follows Geerhardus Vos's definition of biblical theology as "the exhibition of the organic process of supernatural revelation in its historic continuity and multiformity."[10] The result is, in Beale's words, a "synthetic formulation about God's purposes in creation, fall, redemption, and consummation."[11] This synthetic formulation, because it deals with the New Testament's development as a summation of the Old Testament storyline, aims to outline how God's purposes climax and are fulfilled in Christ. This gives the work a broader scope than other New Testament theologies.[12]

The volume also excises discussions typically found in a New Testament theology. For example, it departs from the patterns of New Testament theologies which focus on the historical Jesus,[13] those who derive New Testament themes from systematic theology,[14] those whose analyses deny the New Testament's theological unity,[15] and those who trace New Testament themes either canonically or chronologically.[16] In contrast, Beale's project is governed by, to use his own words, "topics that are prominent facets of Genesis 1-3 and are

---

10. Geerhardus Vos, "The Idea of Biblical Theology," in *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation: the Shorter Writings of Geerhardus Vos*, ed. Richard B. Gaffin (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980) 15.

11. Beale, *NTBT*, 5.

12. This whole-Bible breadth is reflected in the title of the book: *A New Testament Biblical Theology*.

13. E.g. Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, trans. Kendrick Grobel (London: SCM, 1952-1955).

14. E.g. Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Theology* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity, 1981), and Leon Morris, *New Testament Theology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1986). Cited by Beale, *NTBT*, 8fn26.

15. Beale, *NTBT*, 7.

16. Beale, *NTBT*, 7f

prominent in the final vision of the consummated regaining of Eden…in Revelation 21-22."[17]

Nevertheless, Beale's work is not unlike every example of New Testament theology; he notes here the New Testament biblical theologies of Hans Hübner and Peter Stühlmacher.[18] According to Beale, both Stühlmacher and Hübner enlist the message of the Old Testament into their New Testament theological reflection; all three scholars bring Old Testament ideas into their New Testament analyses. Additionally on this topic, Beale notes positively C.H. Dodd's 1952 work *According to the Scriptures: The Substructure of New Testament Theology*.[19] In that seminal work, Dodd asserted that the Old Testament formed an ideological substructure for the writers of the New Testament. This substructure provided the "major theological categories and their framework of thought which was finally interpreted by the saving event of Jesus's coming."[20] Beale writes that his own work proceeds from this assumption, yet notes that it differs from Stühlmacher, Hübner, and Dodd[21] in that *A New Testament Biblical Theology* takes several chapters initially to summarize the Old Testament story.[22] This summary ideologically contextualizes Beale's New Testament analysis, particularly his intertextual studies, which he presents in the same volume. Stühlmacher, Hübner, and Dodd do not include such a summary in their theological reflection.

This brings us to another unique aspect of Beale's *A New Testament Biblical Theology*: its use of ancient near eastern cultural ideas. Because Beale summarizes the Old Testament before proceeding to his analysis of the New, it is clear to the discerning reader how insights from ancient near eastern studies influence his

---

17. Beale, *NTBT*, 23.

18. Beale, *NTBT*, 10f.

19. C.H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952).

20. Beale, *NTBT*, 11.

21. Beale, *NTBT*, 11f.

22. Beale, *NTBT*, 29-160.

New Testament theology. For example, early in the book, Beale asserts that the ancient near eastern concept of a king reigning in the image of a god "appears to be the best background against which to understand Adam."[23] Because Beale centralizes the role of Adam and Eve in his understanding of the entire canon, this ancient near eastern idea affects the rest of his biblical theology, significantly the identity and reign of Christ in the New Testament.

Beale writes that "one of the main goals of this book is to demonstrate further the Old Testament background for the theology of the New Testament."[24] Beale is probably not the first author to comment on the New Testament in this fashion. For example, in the works of Meredith Kline, one of the individuals to whom the book is dedicated,[25] ancient near eastern studies have bearing on New Testament discussions.[26] Though scholarly consensus seems to have clearly identified ancient near eastern aspects throughout the Old Testament,[27] the extent to which Beale integrates these ancient near eastern aspects into his interpretation of the New Testament represents another area of Beale's uniqueness.

Though Beale is like Hübner and Stühlmacher in that his New Testament theology also draws on Old Testament themes, Beale differs in how he uses the Old Testament insights vis-à-vis New Testament insights. Unlike these two other scholars, Beale seems to follow Brevard Childs more closely on the issue of the relationship between the New and Old Testaments.[28] Childs held that the New Testament's use of the Old Testament does not cancel the Old Testament's

---

23. Beale, *NTBT*, 30.

24. Beale, *NTBT*, 13.

25. Beale, *NTBT*, v.

26. Meredith G. Kline, "A Study in the Structure of the Revelation of John," unpublished paper (Westminster Theological Seminary, 1945).

27. E.g. Jeffrey J. Niehaus, *God at Sinai: Covenant and Theophany in the Bible and Ancient Near East* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995).

28. Beale mentions Childs on this point. Beale, *NTBT*, 10-12.

discrete witness to Christ.[29] In other words, the Old Testament texts functioned in their own right as God's words to the generations which first received them, and therefore can serve today's Church by not only pointing forward to Christ in the New Testament, but by revealing God's redemptive acts within those more ancient situations. Childs takes issue with biblical theologians whose work severs this "vertical" dimension of the Old Testament by only reckoning with the Old Testament's "horizontal" foreshadowing of Jesus.[30] He writes, "Each testament deserves to have its own witness heard separately on its own terms, after which and in light of which the two can then be related to each other."[31] On this point Childs specifically rejects Stühlmacher and others following what he terms the "Tübingen form of Biblical Theology."[32]

Beale's survey of the Old Testament storyline seems to share this Childsian concern to hear the Old Testament "on its own terms" before bringing it into dialogue with the New. Beale's use of ancient near eastern concepts to interpret the Old Testament reflects this concern. More generally, though, this facet of Childs's influence seems evident in the way Beale utilizes intertextuality. Beale's biblical-theological method rests upon exploring the intertextuality of New and Old Testament texts.[33] This involves finding key words and concepts shared between passages, and then explaining how and why newer passages quote and allude to older ones. Beale holds that in these cases a kind of mutual illumination occurs. Passages written later "unpack the meaning of that earlier Scripture, and yet the earlier passage also sheds light on the later passage."[34] In

---

29. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress, 1993) 80, 551.

30. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology: A Proposal* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2002) 53.

31. Beale, *NTBT*, 10, citing Brevard Childs.

32. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology*, 52, commenting upon Peter Stühlmacher's *Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 2 vols. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992, 1999).

33. Beale, *NTBT*, 13. Cf. also Beale and Donald A. Carson, eds., *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007).

34. Beale, *NTBT*, 3. He continues, "This is my view of the famous dictum, 'Scripture interprets Scripture.'"

the case of the New Testament quoting the Old, then, Beale claims that the Old Testament not only reaches its fulfillment in the New – it is "unpacked" by the New Testament, to use Beale's verb – but that the Old Testament text, particularly when seen within its redemptive-historical era, sheds light upon the New Testament passage that cites it. His interpretation, then, investigates how a particular text "seeks to give its interpretation first with regard to its own literary context and primarily in relation to its own redemptive-historical epoch, and then to the epoch or epochs preceding and following."[35] Here Beale notes that "the usual approach of standard New Testament theologies" does not utilize "the interpretation of New Testament texts in relation to the preceding epochs found in the Old Testament."[36]

Said differently, Beale seems to be indicating that the Old Testament should be heard on its own terms before being brought to bear upon the New Testament text. In this, though he does not express it outrightly, it seems that he is tracing out something similar to a Childsian understanding of the relationship between the testaments.

Similarity to Childs, however, does not account for every area of uniqueness in Beale's work. Another area of note in Beale's *A New Testament Biblical Theology* concerns its ideological reliance upon the concept of inaugurated eschatology.[37] Describing this part of his method, Beale cites an article by William Manson.[38] Manson wrote that the New Testament assumes that "[w]hat has been predicted in Holy Scripture as to happen to Israel or to man in the Eschaton, has happened to and in Jesus. The foundation-stone of the New Creation has come into position."[39] Following Manson's thesis, Beale observes that the apostles thought of eschatology not as the discussion of the future, but

---

35. Beale, *NTBT*, 9.

36. Beale, *NTBT*, 9.

37. Beale, *NTBT*, 23-25.

38. William Manson, "Eschatology in the New Testament," in *Eschatology: Four Papers Read to the Society for the Study of Theology*, SJTOP 2 (Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1953) 6.

39. Beale, *NTBT*, 18. Citing William Manson, "Eschatology in the New Testament," 6.

"as a mind-set for understanding the present within the climaxing context of redemptive history."[40]

Growing from this presupposition, eschatological aspects and concerns run throughout Beale's project. In this, Beale develops and extends a well-worn path trod by scholars such as Alan Richardson,[41] Richard Gaffin,[42] Oscar Cullman,[43] Herman Ridderbos,[44] and George Eldon Ladd,[45] to a depth and extent untouched by these scholars. Proposing that the concept of eschatology should be redefined,[46] Beale enlists eschatological concepts throughout the book.

As the discussion thus far has demonstrated, Beale explicitly aligns his project with the work of Vos, Stühlmacher, Hübner, Dodd, and Ladd.[47] At key points,[48] though, Beale also mentions the work of Brevard Childs, and Beale's use of intertextuality may reflect a greater similarity to Childs than he admits. In particular, we observed that the form and content of his theological reflection seems to proceed according to a concern for both the Old and New Testaments to be appropriately incorporated into biblical-theological reflection. We now move on to review the critical reception of Beale's *A New Testament Biblical Theology*.

---

40. Beale, *NTBT*, 18.

41. Alan Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1958).

42. Richard B. Gaffin, *The Centrality of the Resurrection* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1978).

43. Oscar Cullmann, *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*, trans. Floyd V. Filson (Philadelpia: Westminster, 1950).

44. Herman Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975).

45. George E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974).

46. Beale, *NTBT*, 23.

47. In tracing themes canonically and in rejecting that the Bible has only one thematic center, Beale's work is also similar to Charles H. Scobie, *The Ways of Our God: An Approach to Biblical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), noted by Beale, *NTBT*, 8.

48. Beale, *NTBT*, 8fn25, 10, 25fn94.

Reception

Old Testament scholar Walter Brueggemann recognizes Beale's work for its self-awareness and openness about its defining agendas. He states that Beale acknowledges his own presuppositions about the nature of Scripture and his theological method clearly and "without subtlety."[49] Other critics note that the fact that Beale's work spans the entire canon may lead to weaknesses in his interpretations of particular texts. Chip McDaniel notes, "[a]s with any thematic treatment that is both comprehensive and sequential, some parts are more demonstrable than others."[50] In addition, Beale's pattern of accruing a wealth of exegetical inferences in support of a particular point, some of which may not be clearly connected to the point at hand, raises questions among some critics.[51]

Howard Marshall's critique of Beale's work is particularly salient, due in part to Marshall's identity as a fellow evangelical New Testament scholar. Concerning Beale's centralization of eschatology, Marshall writes:

> The term recurs incessantly; indeed Beale has a field day with 'inaugurated eschatology', 'semieschatological', 'eschatological-like', 'prototypical eschatology', and the like!...It may be worth remembering that the term 'eschatological' is not biblical; Jesus and Paul actually got along without using it; and it is confusing to use a noun that strictly refers to 'the *study* of the last things' to mean 'the last things themselves'.[52]

Marshall's objection to the starkly eschatological bent of Beale's work is related to his neighboring critique that there should be more biblical and conceptual description of what life is like in this age.[53] But Marshall's critique, while rightly

---

49. Walter Brueggemann, review of *A New Testament Biblical Theology* by Gregory K. Beale, *Interpretation* 67.1 (January 2013): 74.

50. Chip McDaniel, review of *The Temple and the Church's Mission* by Gregory K. Beale, *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 49.1 (March 2006): 187f.

51. David G. Firth, review of *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, by Gregory K. Beale, *European Journal of Theology* 18.2 (2009): 195f; Kent E. Brower, review of *The Temple and the Church's Mission* by Gregory K. Beale, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31.5 (August 2009): 1f; I. Howard Marshall, review of *A New Testament Biblical Theology* by Gregory K. Beale, *Themelios* 37.2 (July 2012): 307-310.

52. I. Howard Marshall, review of *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, 308.

53. I. Howard Marshall, review of *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, 310.

questioning the ubiquity of the term "eschatology" throughout *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, does not seem to grapple with the fact that, for Beale, the present world is itself eschatological. Discussions of eschatology therefore involve discussing the world today, and vice versa.[54]

Marshall also takes issue with Beale's reliance on intertextual observations, claiming that verbal coincidences in Scripture do not always indicate that significant meaning is present. Marshall here, accurately, compares Beale's work with aspects of Richard Hays's work.[55] The lack of agreement between Marshall, Hays, and Beale on the possible range of meanings of intertextualities connects to what is perhaps the most significant critique of Beale's work.

The scope of Beale's project leads to his engagement with a wide variety of exegetical situations. In addition to examining a large number of Scripture passages, he also, as mentioned, calls on concepts from ancient near eastern studies and intertestamental Jewish writings.[56] A discussion this broad includes moments of interpretive uncertainty; this may be inevitable based on the aims of his project, but this uncertainty may alienate some readers. In addition to this, the sheer number of intertextual connections that Beale perceives is often difficult for a reader, even a reader with significant biblical knowledge, to follow and substantiate. As these interconnections form a major part of the work, this difficulty endures throughout the volume.

It seems clear, however, that because Beale has long researched intertestamental intertextualities,[57] his observations do hold value beyond merely

---

54. Beale, *NTBT*, 23.

55. I. Howard Marshall, review of *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, 310. Beale himself has also acknowledged a likeness to Hays's work in *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012) 32f.

56. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 29-186.

57. E.g. Beale, ed., *The Right Doctrine From the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1994).

being opinions. What exactly might this value be? This question brings us to a key facet of Beale's work.

In moments where Beale offers a possibility for what an intertextuality may imply, his work proceeds in what might be called a subjunctive mode of expression, using qualifiers like "may,"[58] "probably,"[59] or "likely explains."[60] Beale seems aware that this is a somewhat uncommon practice among biblical theologians; he openly acknowledges that some scholars will "debate the validity of some of the references,"[61] and thus uses these rhetorics of probability. However, a discerning reader might ask: is this truly the way to pursue biblical theology? In comparison to the tone exhibited by, for example, relatively recent New Testament works of Howard Marshall,[62] Donald Guthrie,[63] Thomas Schreiner,[64] Frank Thielman,[65] and Stephen Dempster,[66] Beale's subjunctive tone seems at times to belie the construction of a merely hypothetical ideological structure. If, so much of the time, all Beale's work can say is that a certain verse "probably" implies something, one might wonder whether it represents a worthwhile project.

This question penetrates deeper into Beale's project than questions of method and structure, for, to a certain extent, it calls into question the basic building block of the whole system. If the oft-used brick of "possible connection" is itself flawed, the stability of the entire structure is questionable. How is a

---

58. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 252. "This may be why Judaism almost universally understood…"

59. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 581fn80. "[P]robably as the agent of…"

60. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 852fn36.

61. Beale, *NTBT*, 4.

62. I. Howard Marshall, *New Testament Theology: Many Witnesses, One Gospel* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity, 2004).

63. Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Theology* (Leicester: Intervarsity, 1990).

64. Thomas Schreiner, *The King in His Beauty: a Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013).

65. Frank S. Thielman, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011).

66. Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible* (Grand Rapids: Intervarsity, 2003).

responsible reader to reckon with this pattern? What is the nature of Beale's contribution, a contribution which seems to depend upon probability rather than exegetical certainty, to New Testament scholarship and the Church? In addition, how does the nature of this contribution, assuming it is positive, strengthen the viceregal homiletic in ways that make it unique among contemporary theological reflection?

Recalling that Beale's manner of relating the Old Testament to the New Testament seemed to follow the work of Brevard Childs, our discussion will now return to some of Childs's more general insights on biblical theology. It will propose that the nature of Beale's project is better understood through a Childsian lens. At this point, then, we turn to several insights from Brevard Childs's work in biblical theology.

Brevard Childs and the Theological Task of Biblical Theology

Brevard S. Childs (1923-2007) served as Professor of Old Testament at Yale University, and developed a method for biblical theology which became known as canonical criticism.[67] Asserting in his 1970 book *Biblical Theology in Crisis*[68] that post-Enlightenment biblical studies had overemphasized the polyvalence of the canon of Scripture, Childs called for a path for post-Enlightenment biblical theology to identify a unified voice in Christian Scripture. Childs was concerned that higher criticism had, in investigating the multiform literary, cultural, and philosophical differences between pericopes, books, and the two testaments of the Christian Bible, lost the ability to identify Scripture speaking to the contemporary Church. The problems and inherent complexities brought to biblical interpretation by post-Enlightenment critical apparatuses required methodological advances for theologians if their projects of Scriptural exegesis and theological reflection were to uphold the unity of the Bible, and therefore its

67. Cf. Daniel R. Driver, *Brevard Childs: Biblical Theologian for the Church's One Bible*.

68. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, 1970).

ability to speak clearly to the contemporary Church and world.[69] In their historical survey of biblical interpretation in the modern era, Roy Harrisville and Walter Sundberg write:

> For Childs the Bible is more than a classic and indispensable witness to God's concern and action, however embodied; its understanding more than a contemporizing of the church's traditions; its ontology more than a paradigm, and more than a documenting of the human experience. For Childs the Bible, in the context of the church's confession, is the instrument of encounter with the living God.[70]

Because the unity of the canon's voice had been called into question, Childs sought to channel the influx of critical insight regarding the polyvalence of Scriptural texts towards a unity congruent with the confessional identity of the church, all while honoring the diversities of those texts.[71]

Childs's publications after 1970 illustrate his own understanding of how post-critical biblical theology might look,[72] and in the process implicitly develop a method for biblical theology. These methodological implications were made more clear in the 2002 publication of Childs's small volume *Biblical Theology: A Proposal*,[73] itself a collection of passages from his prior publications which summarize his method.

---

69. This paragraph's account is indebted to Daniel R. Driver, *Brevard Childs: Biblical Theologian for the Church's One Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010).

70. Roy Harrisville and Walter Sundberg, *The Bible in Modern Culture: theology and historical-critical method from Spinoza to Käsemann* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995) 325.

71. The method for biblical theology which Childs proposed to respond to this crisis was not without its predecessors. For example, see Thomas F. Torrance's appropriation of Athanasius's concept of the "scope and character of Holy Scripture," summarily discussed in *Reality and Evangelical Theology: The Realism of Christian Revelation* (Downer's Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity, 1999) 106f.

72. E.g., Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments;* see also *Isaiah: A Commentary* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, 2004).

73. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology: A Proposal* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Augsburg Fortress, 2002).

It is helpful to note here that Childs's method for biblical theology is a constructive theological project,[74] and is therefore comparable to instructions for building a structure. The following paragraphs which summarize Childs's method for biblical theology will therefore use the analogy of building a house to help illustrate the basic parts of Childs's method for biblical theology.

First, for Childs, deconstructive historical-critical tools are used to dig downward and create the foundation for the structure. The entire building rests upon this foundation of critical inquiry and its descriptive fruit.[75] Upon this foundation of exegesis three levels rise. The first floor consists of building the discrete witnesses of both the Old and New Testaments.[76] The second floor consists of synthesizing those discrete witnesses into a single, canonical witness to Jesus Christ.[77]

Atop the two levels is a third floor – what we might call a rooftop chapel.[78] This chapel is where, after listening to the exegesis in the basement and constructing the biblical theologies in the first and second floors, God's voice is encountered in the present as the biblical theologian rereads the canon Christocentrically, listening for the contemporary voice of God instructing the Church.

---

74. Cf. Brevard S. Childs, who claims that biblical theology by itself is a "fully developed Christian theological reflection." Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology: A Proposal*, 70.

75. Childs "writes that serious theological exposition of the biblical text requires attention to the entire range of problems involving text and source criticism, syntax and grammar, history and geography…determination of milieu, date, authorship, addressees, literary growth, and the like." Roy A. Harrisville and Walter Sundberg, *The Bible in Modern Culture: Baruch Spinoza to Brevard Childs*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002) 312. Cf. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology: A Proposal*, 62f.

76. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology: A Proposal*, 13-29, 76-80.

77. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology: A Proposal*, 44-55, esp. 54.

78. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology: A Proposal*, 56f, 61f, 66-70.

For Childs, biblical theology is incomplete without this chapel, that is, without revisiting the entire canon in light of the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus.[79] Childs writes:

> There is an important function of hearing the whole of Christian scripture in the light of the full reality of God in Jesus Christ. In other words, there is a legitimate place for a move from a fully developed Christian theological reflection back to the biblical texts of both testaments.[80]

This rereading of the canon was when, for example, Christian typological readings were appropriate. The "oneness of the Bible's scope" was "grounded" in Jesus Christ.[81] It was appropriate, then, for the biblical theologian to revisit biblical texts through the lens of Christ, now that the lens was sufficiently tempered by biblical theology. This rereading was therefore sensitive to the Christocentric nature of God's revelation.

During this Christocentric revisiting of the canon, the biblical theologian had opportunity to experience the "ability of biblical language to resonate in a new and creative fashion when read from the vantage point of fuller understanding of Christian truth."[82] Childs clarifies that "such a reading is not intended to threaten the literal sense of the text, but to extend through figuration

---

79. Daniel R. Driver, *Brevard Childs*, 11.

80. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology: A Proposal*, 70. Childs differentiates this Christocentric reading from what he terms "the Biblicist attempt," which ends up flattening Scripture's contemporary Christological witness in favor of finding correlates to particulars within the world of the Bible within particulars of the contemporary world. He writes:

> The modern theological function of canon lies in its affirmation that the authoritative norm lies in the literature itself as it has been treasured, transmitted, and transformed – of course in constant relation to its object to which it bears witness – *and not in 'objectively' reconstructed stages of the process.* The term canon points to the received, collected, and interpreted material of the church and thus establishes the theological context in which the tradition continues to function authoritatively for us today.
>
> Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*, 71, italics added.

81. Daniel R. Driver, *Brevard Childs*, 11.

82. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology: A Proposal*, 70f.

a reality that has only been partially heard."[83] In this way, Childs's biblical theology functioned to voice Scripture to the contemporary world.

Childs calls this function of biblical theology its "theological task." Unlike the other stages of the biblical theologian's process, the theological task brings the biblical theologian into dialogue with the divine demands impinging upon his present situation. Biblical theology is therefore not simply an academic process, untouched by the theologian's contemporary world. The biblical theologian fully attending to Scripture must lead to a dynamic engagement with God's claims in the present. Childs writes:

> The enterprise of Biblical Theology is theological because by faith seeking understanding in relation to the divine reality, the divine imperatives are no longer moored in the past, but continue to confront the hearer in the present with the truth. Therefore it is constitutive of Biblical Theology that…it be responsive to the imperatives of the present and not just of the past.[84]

In other words, the Christian biblical theologian, having exegeted the canon and traced out its witness to Christ, ascends to the chapel to discern God's will for the Church. With all of his exegetical and theological research in hand, the biblical theologian, according to Childs, must reckon with God himself before truly calling his research "biblical theology." He therefore reopens Scripture with contemporary needs, personal and ecclesial, in mind, and reads the texts accordingly. This kind of theological reflection is, to return to Childs's words, "responsive to the needs of the present and not just of the past."

This Christocentric, "theological" rereading of the text was the summit of Brevard Childs's vision for a robust, post-Enlightenment biblical theology which was able to discern God's univocal message for the contemporary world. Biblical theology entailed, for Childs, "far more than 'explanation';"[85] it required "serious

---

83. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology: A Proposal*, 70f.

84. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*, 86.

85. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*, 88.

wrestling with the content of Scripture"[86] in light of the entire canon's message. The fundamental assumption undergirding all of Childs's observations seems to be that God speaks to the Church and the world through Scripture today.

Brevard Childs's understanding of biblical theology was not without its detractors,[87] some of whom offered helpful critiques. Pertinent to our discussion at hand, the words of Walter Brueggemann capture the essence of one key objection to Childs's project. Brueggemann writes that, for Childs,

> ...interpretation is to be done in the context of the faith of the church and in the service of its practice. In a variety of ways he has opposed the practice of "autonomous" interpretation outside the matrix of faith that is characteristic of the academic guild, which is preoccupied with historical questions, and which regards historical criticism as the goal and end of interpretation. From Childs's perspective, the nature of the biblical material itself makes interpretation inescapably theological. It has as its subject the theological claims made in and through the text and received by the church.[88]

These words of Brueggemann touch on a key characteristic of Childs's work: Childs seems to expect biblical theology to serve and exist ultimately within the Church, not the academy. To an academic eye, Childs's work, both his method and its resulting theological reflection, may suffer fatal lapses in specificity and

---

86. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*, 88. Emphasizing that robust biblical engagement must require a discerning of the text's message for a particular context, he adds,

> It is a strange irony that those examples of biblical interpretation in the past which have truly immersed themselves in a specific historical context, such as Luther in Saxony, retain the greatest value as models for the future actualization of the biblical text in a completely different world. Conversely those biblical commentators who laid claim to an objective, scientific explanation of what the text really meant, often appear as uninteresting museum pieces to the next generation.

87. E.g. James Barr, "Childs' Theologies," in *The Concept of Biblical Theology: An Old Testament Perspective* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress, 1999) 400-438. Barr writes:

> Childs' publications in biblical theology are likely to do great harm to the subject and its prospects, particularly because they confirm the most significant suspicions of the enemies of biblical theology...Even for those devoted to the advancement of biblical theology Childs offers little. He does not offer a method which can be followed by others, especially if they do not share his views in full.

88. Walter Brueggemann, "Canon Fire: The Bible as Scripture," *Christian Century* (December 4, 2001) 22.

objectivity. This is not to infer that his work excludes critical engagement with Scripture, but that the pattern of his reflection has as its goal the elucidation of what the Church has already believed rather than the deconstruction of teachings historically held by the Church. To return to Brueggemann's words, Childs "opposed…interpretation outside the matrix of faith that is characteristic of the academic guild…which regards historical criticism as the goal and end of interpretation."[89]

In light of these critiques, Brevard Childs's method for biblical theology perhaps should be termed more ecclesial than academic. Childs's work includes academic criticism of Scripture; as we have seen, Childs does not reject post-Enlightenment critical apparatuses. But suggesting that Childs's work is ecclesial affirms that his project surpasses mere criticism of Scripture. Childs's work assumes the Christian God's existence and aims to discern God's contemporary voice speaking to the Church. It thus acknowledges a role for prayer and worship in the process of biblical theology, as well as the Church as the legitimate end for the biblical theological process.

For Childs, then, the nature of Scripture calls not only for critical engagement with Scriptural texts, but for serious wrestling with the contemporary demands of God conveyed by those texts. Because of this understanding, Childs would hold that all biblical theologians should be academically critical of Scripture, but not all those who are academically critical deserve to be called biblical theologians. The difference between the two groups is, to return to the analogy of Childs's process as constructing a building, that only one group ascends to the rooftop chapel. Childs implies that only biblical theologians who have ascended to the chapel can truly be called biblical theologians, for only they have rightly perceived the nature of Scripture as inviting personal involvement in the Christocentric creation of the Christian God. It is this chapel that offers a context for a Christocentric rereading of the

89. Walter Brueggemann, "Canon Fire," 22.

canon sensitive to the demands of the present. Within this chapel, the biblical theologian explores the "ability of biblical language to resonate in a new and creative fashion when read from the vantage point of fuller understanding of Christian truth;" and is then able to "extend through figuration a reality that has only been partially heard."[90] Academic criticism, then, serves the purpose of hearing God through Scripture, but is not to be equated with encountering the Christian God of Scripture. In other words, for Childs the end of biblical theology was the Church, not the academy, and this fact called for a different kind of task from the truly biblical theologian.

Rightly, then, Brueggemann notes that Childs's project is not strictly academic, for the Childsian biblical theologian must venture up to the chapel, must think in the present and suggest how biblical themes, types, and words impinge upon the present realities of Church and world. The theological task of Childs's biblical theology sponsors this.

Beale's Work as Childsian Theological Task of Biblical Theology

In the light of this theological task of Childsian biblical theology, we can now continue the former discussion regarding the biblical-theological work of Gregory Beale. Beale's penchant for stockpiling exegetical evidence for a particular point was noted above, with the observation that this sometimes created a subjunctive mood for Beale's biblical-theological reflection. The question at hand currently is whether Beale's reflection can properly be called biblical theology if so much of his work depends on merely probable intertextuality. If all points cannot be directly proven from the text, is the project still valid Christian scholarship?

Yet in noting Brevard Childs's theological task of biblical theology, a pertinent insight has emerged: limiting the biblical theologian's interpretive process strictly to academic questions may disallow biblical-theological reflection to honor Scripture fully. Directly proving from the text rightly lies within the

90. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology: A Proposal*, 70f.

scope of critical exegesis; yet beyond and after such a critical process lies a second, Christocentric reading of Scripture, done in faith, to hear the contemporary voice of God. This second reading takes account of God's demands in the present, and seeks to bring contemporary reality under the descriptive rubrics of Scripture.

In the light of this insight from Childs's theological task of biblical theology, a discerning reader might wonder whether Beale's entire project might be better understood as moving towards a Christocentric theological rereading of the canon for the benefit of the Church rather than a strictly critical, academic reading of the canon. To return to the image of Childs's method as a three-story structure, though Beale and others may view his work as a two-story structure, it seems that the project anticipates the existence and importance of the rooftop chapel. Perhaps Beale's work has begun to climb the stairs to the chapel, for it seems to be moving beyond academic questions and towards a discussion of how Scriptural types figure the Church today.

Though Beale himself does not write of his project in this way, several facets of Beale's work seem to affirm that he ultimately has in mind the contemporary Church, not the academy. Early in *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, Beale claims that biblical theology functions not only to describe the canon, but to prescribe action for the Church.[91] He states that "this kind of prescriptive element…is found in varying degrees in other New Testament theologies,"[92] and then, in contrast, notes a key prescriptive conviction in his own work: "…one of the important biblical-theological ideas formulated in this book entails that believers ought to take part in expanding God's new-creational kingdom."[93] This prescriptive function that Beale sees in his own work is indicative of an interest in the Church rather than merely the academy.

---

91. Beale, *NTBT*, 5.
92. Beale, *NTBT*, 5.
93. Beale, *NTBT*, 5.

This ecclesial concern is evident also in the structure of Beale's work. In one of his earlier books, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, after an investigation of how the Church is to grow the dwelling place of God throughout the creation, Beale offers "practical reflections...for the church of the twenty-first century."[94] Likewise, Beale's *A New Testament Biblical Theology* ends with a proportionately much longer conclusion[95] that suggests how the "inaugurated end-times new creation"[96] contours over twenty aspects of the Church's contemporary life.

Beale writes in the beginning of his *A New Testament Biblical Theology*:

> This book...is primarily aimed at serious Christian readers, whether they be people in the church who are not scholars or college or graduate theology students...[it] focuses on biblical interpretation and biblical theology and much less on practical application...Nevertheless, I hope that readers can glean theological principles with a view to living as faithful Christians who have one foot in the old world and the other in the emerging new world.[97]

Though Beale claims the book does not contain much "practical application," his concern for the contemporary relevance of biblical theology implies a project not merely academic in character, but tending towards ecclesial concerns. In this, it seems that Beale's reflection is compatible with Childs's third floor chapel.

In addition to this general ecclesial concern of Beale's work, it seems legitimate to call Beale's *A New Testament Biblical Theology* Christocentric, for in both form and content it appears to be an extensively developed Scriptural project which views the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ as central in the entire sweep of redemptive history. This Christocentricity exhibited throughout the project is perhaps unique in its interest in the Adamic character of Christ's person and office, as well as its inclusion of concepts in theological reflection which are

---

94. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*, 395.
95. Beale, *NTBT*, 885-962.
96. Beale, *NTBT*, 962.
97. Beale, *NTBT*, 25.

not always associated with Christocentric readings of Scripture,[98] for example, the Spirit's resurrectional empowerment of the Church's "new-creational reign" with Christ[99] and the revivification of the image of God in believers through the resurrection of Christ.[100] Through all these discussions, it seems that the work as a whole is explicitly Christocentric to an extent perhaps unseen in prior New Testament theologies.

Along with and because of these ecclesial and Christocentric characteristics, it seems fitting to suggest that Beale's work at times exhibits, to use Childs's words, "the ability of biblical language to resonate in a new and creative fashion when read from the vantage point of fuller understanding of Christian truth."[101] Childs clarified that "such a reading is not intended to threaten the literal sense of the text, but to extend through figuration a reality that has only been partially heard."[102] If it is accurate to see these facets of Childs's method for biblical theology functioning in Beale, fellow scholars might excuse Beale's dependence, at certain points, upon a probability of intertextuality rather than straightforward exegetical certitude, for it seems that Beale is looking not for the mere literal sense of the text, but a Christocentric rereading wherein Scripture is brought to bear upon "the imperatives of the present, and not just of the past."[103] Inasmuch as this is the case, Beale's project as a whole might be understood as an exercise to responsibly and faithfully "extend through figuration"[104] aspects of the Scriptural witness relevant to the Church's contemporary witness.

---

98. Beale mentions and explains how his articulation of justification and reconciliation connect unconventionally with "the storyline dealing with Jesus's death for sinners and his resurrection." Beale, *NTBT*, 16fn63.

99. Beale, *NTBT*, 227-356.

100. Beale, *NTBT*, 357-468.

101. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology: A Proposal*, 70.

102. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology: A Proposal*, 71.

103. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*, 86.

104. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology: A Proposal*, 70f.

If this suggestion for viewing Beale's work is accurate, *A New Testament Biblical Theology* proceeds more like a Childsian Christocentric rereading of the canon than a merely historical-critical engagement with the New Testament. That is, it seems more to be working towards a coherent and fresh articulation of the Lordship of Jesus Christ in the contemporary world than simply using historical-critical exegesis to construct what the New Testament meant in its original context. Perhaps it is incorrect, then, to expect Beale's intertextual interpretations to arrive always at the sort of certainty expected of historical-critical exegesis. Understanding Beale's work in light of Childs's theological task of biblical theology opens this possibility. Prior critical scrutiny and a profession of faith has set the bounds within which Beale now writes, and those bounds, which initially served to separate truth from heresy, now circumscribe an area in which the Christian scholar can profitably re-examine Scripture and propose how Christ's reign informs contemporary circumstances. Such re-examination involves both scholarly inquiry and a sanctified curiosity in a reflective process which connects concepts and texts that may have previously appeared unrelated. In this light, Beale's subjunctive mood of theological reflection, far from being a liability to his project, may be one of its greatest assets for the contemporary Church.

But how does this relate to the uniqueness of the viceregal homiletic? It seems evident that the ecclesial concern of Beale's method might enhance the viceregal homiletic in general fashion, but how is Beale's method congruent with the viceregal homiletic's uniqueness?

The following section will begin to develop this argument by more closely examining the three areas, noted at the beginning of this chapter in its summary of Chapters 1 and 2, in order to demonstrate how Beale's biblical-theological method aligns with each.

Beale's Method and the Viceregal Homiletic

The prior two chapters of this thesis stated that the viceregal homiletic possesses three characteristics which encapsulate its uniqueness in comparison to recent homiletical reflection in North America.

1) The viceregal homiletic reflects theologically on Christian preaching, that is, it considers preaching with the Christian God in view in order to describe preaching within the ordered structures of creation.

2) The viceregal homiletic pursues preaching directly, not indirectly via other insights or systematic doctrines. It assumes that preaching possesses importance and integrity sufficient to warrant customized consideration.

3) The viceregal homiletic proceeds biblical-theologically; however, in contrast to at least one existing biblical-theological homiletic, the viceregal homiletic extends the biblical-theological process to create a theological vision through which to view Christian preaching in the contemporary and future worlds, not merely in the past. The following paragraphs will discuss how Beale's work is congruent with and enhances these points of the viceregal homiletic's uniqueness.

1) Considers Christian preaching in a theological mode

The first chapter of this thesis argued that the viceregal homiletic differs from the majority of existing homiletical reflection because it proceeds in a theological, rather than a rhetorical, mode. The chapter observed that theological reflection alone provides the ability for homiletics to evaluate how preaching fits into God's creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Jesus Christ, and therefore to justify and explicate homiletics' distinctly Christian character and mission. The chapter also observed the necessity of not pitting the theological and rhetorical modes of reflection against one another, and proposed a model whereby both modes' unique contributions can be affirmed.

Beale's biblical-theological work is congruent with this kind of a homiletical project because it provides an ideological structure from which to

view preaching in light of the Christian God. Beale's work frames the entire creation, including the contemporary Church, in view of God's acts of creation, redemption, and consummation. Such ideological structuring enables homiletics to observe and describe preaching in a theological mode; it implies statements that are fundamentally different than rhetorical observations about preaching.

Beale's work does not prescribe specific rhetorical practices or patterns for Christian preaching. What Beale does write about preaching is general in tone and intent, and therefore leaves options open for how a preacher might rhetorically develop a sermon. One example of this is Beale's conviction that Christian preaching must proclaim to believers both their obligation and their Spirit-empowered ability to obey the commands of God.[105] This kind of an observation is congruent with theological homiletics, for it is a statement about how Christian preaching exists in relation to God's redemption rather than mere rhetorical considerations of the utility or efficiency of the act. It is therefore poised to inform a philosophy of Christian preaching rather than a method for building a sermon.

The following chapter will more fully develop this point in its discussion of how Beale's articulation of Christian viceregency strengthens the viceregal homiletic as it proceeds in a theological mode of reflection. At this point, one observation will be sufficient to preview Chapter 4's discussion: the viceregal homiletic asserts that preachers are Christian viceregents, and, in turn, understands Christian viceregency according to Beale's work. The category *Christian viceregent*, however, is ideologically broader than the category *Christian preacher*. Though the viceregal homiletic's claim that the preacher is a Christian viceregent does communicate that all preachers are Christian viceregents, it is not a claim that all Christian viceregents are preachers. Christian viceregents make up a larger set of which all Christian preachers are a part. Beale's biblical

---

105. Beale, *NTBT*, 961f. Beale explains that believers identifying with Christ's resurrection and receiving the Holy Spirit means that they can follow the commands of God. Beale, *NTBT*, 303f.

theology of Christian viceregency therefore describes not only how Christian preaching serves to expand Christ's reign over creation, but how any Christian who is in step with the Spirit does so.[106]

In this way, Beale's work enables the viceregal homiletic to avoid the lacunae of both the insight-theological and systematic-theological modes, reviewed in Chapter 2. Rather than piecing together disparate insights about what Christian preaching is like, the viceregal homiletic's central image not only sums up the entire canon of Scripture, but is also ideologically broader than the image "preacher" so that it can describe all preachers and instances of Christian preaching. In this way, the viceregal homiletic can locate the essence of Christian preaching in proximity to other phenomena in God's world while remaining a customized account of what Christian preaching is. Scrutinizing the preacher as a Christian viceregent allows the viceregal homiletic to pursue this holistic and integrated understanding of Christian preaching.

The viceregal homiletic's central image is therefore broader than Christian preaching alone, yet remains appropriately focused upon what theological insights are necessary to understand the act of Christian preaching. Beale's viceregency enhances the viceregal homiletic by providing this broader viewpoint of the preacher, something which is congruent with a theological homiletic, and yet also provides the idea of the preacher with an immediate ideological context in which to be scrutinized.

Thus, Beale's articulation of Christian viceregency strengthens the viceregal homiletic's scrutiny of the act of Christian preaching within the theological mode. With this in mind, we now turn to how Beale's biblical-theological method relates to the second strength of the viceregal homiletic.

---

106. Beale, *NTBT*, 912f.

2) Pursues Christian preaching directly

The viceregal homiletic assumes that Christian preaching is sufficiently important to the life of the Church for it to be scrutinized in its own right. The viceregal homiletic therefore pursues Christian preaching directly, that is, as a thing itself, and not indirectly via examining or combining other things.

Chapter 2 noted how systematic-theological reflection on the act of Christian preaching can construe the perception of Christian preaching according to the priorities of the theology used to describe it.[107] It was observed that this kind of homiletical reflection seems to imply that Christian preaching only exists, or can only be described, in relation to or as subsidiaries of, other parts of creation. In other words, in comparison to the homiletical reflection produced by the viceregal homiletic, these systematic-theological homiletics describe Christian preaching indirectly. The importance and unique identity of Christian preaching does not centrally drive these lines of inquiry.

In contrast, the viceregal homiletic, while acknowledging that Christian preaching exists alongside and within other parts of creation, scrutinizes Christian preaching directly. Preaching, the viceregal homiletic assumes, has been granted a status of significance in the Church sufficient for it to be studied. In this view, Christian preaching is not merely a coincidental and beneficent result of, for example, Scripture, Spirit, preacher, and congregation cooperating, though Christian preaching integrally involves each of these things. Rather, the viceregal homiletic assumes that Christian preaching is best understood in relation to God, proceeding from a particular idea in the mind of God. By assuming all this, the viceregal homiletic is then able to ask, "What is Christian preaching in the mind of God? What, then, is Christian preaching?"

Beale's project is congruent with this kind of homiletical reflection. By neither construing Christian preaching according to a particular systematic idea, as in the systematic-theological mode, nor separating Christian preaching from

107. Cf. page 55 of Chapter 2.

the broader ideological fabric woven by Scripture, as in the insight-theological mode, Beale's work allows the viceregal homiletic to pursue Christian preaching itself from within its comprehensive and summative biblical-theological vision of creation. Preaching itself requires no ideological distortion in order to fit into this vision.

Though Beale claims that the ultimate end of his New Testament storyline is the glory of God,[108] he also holds that "the main stepping-stone to that goal is Christ's establishment of an eschatological new-creational kingdom and its expansion."[109] Thus, Beale's work describes not only the goal of the creation, but how Scripture describes God's redemptive work, and therefore creation's journey, towards that goal. Creation is not simply accidental in Beale's account of God's redemption, but is itself both venue and recipient of that redemption.[110] In this, Beale's work seems to imply, rightly, that comprehending creation is necessary if one is to perceive rightly God's actions in creation.

This differs from the faults of the systematic-theological mode of homiletical reflection, which seemed to imply that Christian preaching only exists, or can only be described, in relation to other acts or attributes of God. Such lines of inquiry did not observe Christian preaching directly in relation to the creation, but indirectly in relation to the attributes of God. In contrast, because Beale's project implies that creation has integrity in itself, it implies that acts of Christian preaching within creation possess a similar integrity, and that this integrity can be scrutinized in a manner similar to how Beale describes creation according to God's works.

3) Proceeds biblical-theologically, and creates a theological vision

Chapter 2 of this thesis argued that the viceregal homiletic proceeds from a distinctive theological vantage point in comparison to other theological reflection

108. Beale, *NTBT*, 16.

109. Beale, *NTBT*, 16.

110. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 905-908.

on Christian preaching in contemporary homiletics. The discussion in that chapter noted that the viceregal homiletic begins from a unified and integrated understanding of Scriptural teaching rather than an uncoordinated accrual of insights from Scripture or elsewhere. On that point the chapter turned to an insight from Richard Lints: Scripture exhibits an inherent unity of structure and message. Lints argued that theological reflection should also cohere as an organic, ideological whole in a manner which mirrors Scripture itself.[111] Echoing Lints, Chapter 2 then argued that the conception of doing homiletical reflection by stringing together discrete ideas about Christian preaching "like pearls in a necklace"[112] seems to undercut an essential unity in what Scripture communicates about the act of Christian preaching.

In light of this, it was observed that the viceregal homiletic proceeds from a unified and integrated understanding of the canon, a theological vision of the world. Gregory Beale's biblical-theological reflection provides this unified and integrated understanding of the world, this theological vision, for the viceregal homiletic.[113]

Beale does not merely provide a general ideological structure in which reflection on the act of Christian preaching might proceed. His understanding of Christian viceregency grants a particular path for the viceregal homiletic to draw holistically from Scripture as it reflects on Christian preaching. In other words, Beale not only offers a landscape and horizons, but an appropriately placed path for the viceregal homiletic to consider Christian preaching as a contextualized part of the whole.

From the outset of *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, it seems clear that Beale intends for his work to be an integrated portrayal of the canon. Though in name his work is a theology of the New Testament, it proceeds upon the themes

---

111. Richard Lints, *The Fabric of Theology*, 261.

112. Richard Lints, *The Fabric of Theology*, 261.

113. Beale, *NTBT*, 16.

introduced in Genesis 1-3[114] and is canonical in scope. He refers to his project as a "synthetic formulation about God's purposes in creation, fall, redemption, and consummation."[115] The fact that the work explicates summary statements for both testaments[116] seems further to imply an intent not only to capture, but integrate the ideas of Christian Scripture into a coherent ideological structure that mirrors the ideological structure of the canon. Worthy of note here is that this structure is not strictly arranged in a topical or doctrinal fashion, as a systematic theology might be, but along the lines of what Beale's work terms "the storyline" of Scripture.[117] The fabric of Beale's theology proceeds according to the priorities and general sequencing of the canonical metanarrative. This plotlike, narratival structure seems a manifestation of Beale's adherence to Vos's theory of biblical theology.[118]

It seems, then, that Beale's *A New Testament Biblical Theology* can be seen as an example of what Richard Lints refers to as a "theological vision" through which to view the contemporary world,[119] for it not only seeks to grasp Scriptural ideas comprehensively, but integrates them into a coherent ideological structure which mirrors that of the canon.

Beale mentions Christian preaching generally within this integrated canonical vision.[120] His project, however, leaves room for additional work reflecting directly upon Christian preaching. The book itself ends on an observation that the work has implications for practical theology and preaching.[121] The viceregal homiletic therefore, in drawing from Beale's biblical-theological

---

114. Beale, *NTBT*, 23.

115. Beale, *NTBT*, 5.

116. Beale, *NTBT*, 16.

117. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 16.

118. Geerhardus Vos, "The Idea of Biblical Theology," in *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation: the Shorter Writings of Geerhardus Vos*, ed. Richard B. Gaffin (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980) 15.

119. Richard Lints, *The Fabric of Theology*, 261.

120. Beale, *NTBT*, 962.

121. Beale, *NTBT*, 962. "I must leave that task to others..."

work, draws not only from a developed theological vision of the world, but a theological vision of the world which has been primed to acknowledge, among other things, the existence and function of Christian preaching in the contemporary world.

Jason Meyer's book *Preaching: A Biblical Theology*[122] was examined earlier in this thesis as an example of homiletical reflection in the biblical-theological mode. Meyer's work attempts to show how the idea of Christian preaching develops in relation to the Scriptural narrative. His work exhibits an inherent strength of biblical-theological reflection for homiletics, which presupposes that Christian preaching has its own essence which manifests in multiform ways during different eras of canonical history.

Yet Meyer's homiletical reflection lacked clear summative statements, flowing directly from his canonical survey, about preaching today. Meyer's discussion admirably presents significant Scriptural data regarding preaching, but lacks a final synthesis of those insights. Chapter 2 therefore observed that Meyer's account of preaching seems more like an accrual of Scriptural insights arranged in canonical order than an account of how the canon progressively reveals what Christian preaching is. Thus, though canonically comprehensive, Meyer's work lacked the integrative facets of developing a theological vision for contemporary Christian preaching. This is perhaps why, even though Meyer's biblical-theological mode of reflection seems poised to ask and answer fruitful questions regarding the essence of Christian preaching from a canonical perspective, his work did not seem to pursue this fully.

The viceregal homiletic aims to surpass Jason Meyer's biblical-theological reflection on Christian preaching by drawing on Gregory Beale's work. Beale's *A New Testament Biblical Theology* repeatedly interconnects the past, present, and future works of God such that any particular act of God in history is considered alongside corresponding prior and subsequent acts. For example, his

122. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching: A Biblical Theology* (Wheaton: Crossway, 2014).

understanding that the contemporary Christian lives an "inaugurated end-time new-creational life,"[123] a concept which he often revisits, hearkens both back to the creation of the world and forward to the Second Coming in order to describe the contemporary realities in which Christians now live. Beale identifies what Christian living is now in light of how it was expressed in the past and will be expressed in the future; he describes it in relation to prior and subsequent epochs of redemptive history. This inaugurated eschatological view is evident in, for example, sections of the book on tribulation,[124] salvation,[125] or the work of the Holy Spirit.[126]

One example of this is found in the conclusion to *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, where he describes "the relationship of inaugurated and consummated realities to the parallel realities experienced by Old Testament saints."[127] That chapter specifically examines more than twenty-five different areas of the Christian life according to "The Old Testament Reality," "The Corresponding Inaugurated End-Time Reality," and "The Corresponding Consummated End-Time Reality."[128] In other words, Beale biblical-theologically describes the past, present, and future of each of these areas of the Christian life.

This biblical-theological pattern of Beale's work, which focuses on contemporary events in light of preceding and subsequent acts of God, strengthens the viceregal homiletic's ability to pursue and answer questions regarding the essence of Christian preaching from a canonical perspective, aligning contemporary Christian preaching with both the redemption of the past and God's promised future. By finding the preacher within Beale's understanding of a Christian viceregent, the viceregal homiletic is able to follow the preacher through Beale's understanding of the canon's story of creation, fall, redemption,

---

123. Beale, *NTBT*, 835-886.
124. Beale, *NTBT*, 187-226.
125. Beale, *NTBT*, 469-558.
126. Beale, *NTBT*, 559-650.
127. Beale, *NTBT*, 887-957.
128. E.g. "The Latter Days," 888f.

and consummation, note how the preacher relates to the past, present, and future acts of God, and thus offer a holistic theological account of what Christian preaching is today.

But this third strength of the viceregal homiletic is enhanced significantly by another aspect of Beale's biblical-theological work. As noted above, both Beale and Jason Meyer proceed according to Geerhardus Vos's understanding of biblical theology as "the exhibition of the organic process of supernatural revelation in its historic continuity and multiformity."[129] Yet Meyer's work, like other biblical-theological reflection in homiletics, does not offer a clear vision of what Christian preaching might be in the eschaton. This seems an inconsistency for homiletical reflection that seeks to be biblical-theological, for biblical-theological reflection depends, in part, upon the scholar looking both behind and ahead to discern a concept's "organic process" within its "historic continuity and multiformity." If Meyer and other biblical-theological homileticians are to be consistent, it seems that they cannot complete their analyses of Christian preaching without some reckoning with what Christian preaching might be in the new creation.

Beale's *A New Testament Biblical Theology* reaches towards such an analysis of the possible future of Christian preaching. During the discussion of "The Spirit's Gifting Role" in different epochs of redemptive history,[130] Beale writes,

> At the consummation the Spirit will complete his work of placing all God's people in the revelatory position of prophets, priests, and kings, a work that began at Pentecost and that continued throughout the church age…when they receive resurrection bodies, they will be in the position of the high priest, dwelling in the holy of holies in the new creation and in God's glorious intimate and special revelatory presence (Rev 22:4-5).[131]

---

129. Geerhardus Vos, "Idea of Biblical Theology," 15.

130. Beale, *NTBT*, 908-910.

131. Beale, *NTBT*, 909.

This excerpt, summarizing and focusing what the book has reasoned in the prior 26 chapters, infers that all believers will possess a "revelatory position" after the Second Coming because of their union with the resurrected Jesus. Elsewhere Beale asserts that the revelatory position of believers is today manifested through their spiritual gifts: "All these gifts, to one degree or another, are ways that believers function…in their position of being prophets, priests, and kings."[132] In other words, Beale asserts that believers today, through their spiritual gifts, experience and manifest a foretaste of the "revelatory position" which they will possess in the new creation after the consummation.

Though what Beale means here by "revelatory position" invites clarification, his insight is informative for biblical-theological reflection that considers Christian preaching's future. Beale's reflection here seems to imply that Christian preaching today looks forward to the consummation: the time when all words and actions of God's people will be congruent with divine revelatory speech. If Beale is followed on this point, it is not, then, that Christian preaching will not exist after the consummation, but that all speech of redeemed humans will be what Christian preaching seeks to be today. All speech will then, in a sense, be Christian preaching.

In this way, then, Beale's biblical-theological reflection enables the viceregal homiletic to, unlike the work of Jason Meyer and other biblical-theological homileticians,[133] reach into the future and speculate upon what Christian preaching might be in the new creation. This capacity allows the viceregal homiletic to remain consistent within its own biblical-theological pattern of both looking back and forward in time in order to discern God's work in contemporary acts of Christian preaching.

---

132. Beale, *NTBT*, 909.

133. Edmund P. Clowney, *Preaching and Biblical Theology* (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1979); Sidney Griedanus, *The Modern Preacher and the Ancient Text: Interpreting and Preaching Biblical Literature* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988).

Conclusion

This chapter has begun to demonstrate that the biblical-theological work, particularly the biblical-theological method, of Beale aligns with and enhances the viceregal homiletic's areas of uniqueness. The chapter has introduced and probed Beale's method by differentiating it with other biblical theologies. In response to critiques of Beale's work which noted his use, or overuse, of intertextuality, the chapter suggested that perhaps Beale's work is better understood in the light of Brevard Childs's model for biblical theology, particularly Childs's insight regarding the "theological task" of biblical theology.

Along the way, our discussion suggested that describing the preacher as a Christian viceregent connects the viceregal homiletic to the strengths of Beale's biblical-theological reflection, and that Beale's strengths correspond with the viceregal homiletic's three areas of uniqueness.

Yet this chapter, by focusing more on Beale's method than the content of his reflection, has not articulated exactly what informs Beale's articulation of Christian viceregency, and therefore the viceregal homiletic. A major question remains to be answered: what is Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency?

CHAPTER 4

Introduction

This thesis has begun to trace out what ways the viceregal homiletic is a new model for homiletical reflection. Chapter 1 noted that the viceregal homiletic proceeds in a theological mode, which grants different insights into the act of Christian preaching than the rhetorical mode. Chapter 2 showed how, in comparison to other homiletical reflection in the theological mode, the viceregal homiletic proceeds in a distinctly biblical-theological manner. Chapter 3 further explored this by examining critically the biblical-theological method of Gregory Beale, which distinguishes the viceregal homiletic from other biblical-theological reflection on Christian preaching.

In mode and method, then, the viceregal homiletic differs from existing contemporary homiletical reflection in North America. Following Beale, it uses a particular biblical-theological method to produce summative statements about what Christian preaching is, and then, moving past Beale, synthesizes those statements into an image of what Christian preaching is at all times and in all places: a typal rendering of the preacher which captures timeless and essential characteristics shared by acts of Christian preaching in every epoch of redemptive history. The viceregal homiletic, then, by borrowing from the biblical-theological method and reflection of Beale, views the preacher as a Christian viceregent.

A Christian viceregent is a Christian who, through the work of Christ and in the name of Christ , expresses God's rule over the creation. On this point the viceregal homiletic borrows Beale's idea that all Christians are viceregents and particularizes it for homiletical reflection. The identity and function of the preacher are captured essentially in the image of a Christian viceregent, such that the title "viceregent" embodies ideologically all of what a preacher was, is, or might be.

Yet the existence of this idea from Beale's work at the center of the viceregal homiletic raises several questions. What exactly does "viceregency" mean? Further, what is Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency, and how does the viceregal homiletic derive its theological vision of Christian preaching from Beale's work particularly?

We turn now to these questions. First we will give a fuller account of what the term "viceregent" means.

The Term "Viceregent"

A *viceregent* is one who rules in the name of a sovereign, particularly when the sovereign is not immediately present.[1] The English term *viceregency* denotes the office and/or reign of a viceregent.[2] The following chart reflects information taken from *The Oxford English Dictionary* as well as Klein's *Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* concerning the term *viceregent*.

viceregent – (vice + regent) - "One who acts in the place of a regent."[3]
vice – from the Latin *vicem* – "stead, place, office"[4] "preferred in titles of office, denoting a substitute or subordinate…'instead of'."[5]
regent – from the Latin *regis*, – "ruler, king" related to *regere*, "to keep straight, guide, lead, rule."[6]

A viceregent is one who acts in the place of a regent, in the regent's stead; he is a substitute or subordinate who assumes the role of leading or guiding a domain. The powers of the sovereign are thus exercised by the viceregent as the viceregent acts in matters general or particular. In one sense, a viceregent

1. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "viceregency."
2. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "viceregency."
3. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.vv. "vicegerency" and "viceregency."
4. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "viceregency."
5. Ernest Klein, *Klein's Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, s.v. "regent."
6. Ernest Klein, *Klein's Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, s.v. "regent."

functions as an ambassador plenipotentiary, yet can do so whether inside or outside the sovereign's immediate presence or capital realm.

Understanding a particular viceregent entails knowing his identity and function in relation to his or her particular sovereign. The viceregent's identity and function are derived from the sovereign; relatedly, the idea of a viceregent is always in proximity to the idea of a sovereign. Viewing a preacher as a viceregent of God therefore positions homiletical reflection to consider the identity and function of the preacher in relation to God. In so doing, it positions homiletical reflection to consider, for example, the nature and limits of the preacher's authority in relation to God's authority, and the shape of the preacher's mission in relation to God's plans for creation. These lines of inquiry, then, reside in the theological mode of homiletical reflection.

Why the Concept of Viceregency?

If the argument of Chapter 1 is correct, contemporary homiletics has neglected to provide an ongoing appraisal of Christian preaching's uniquely Christian character and mission. In centralizing the statement that the preacher is a viceregent of God, however, the viceregal homiletic considers directly the preacher in relation to the Christian God, and thus positions itself to give an account of how Christian preaching is a uniquely Christian activity. Homiletical reflection emanating from the concept of viceregency, then, is positioned to address this lacuna in contemporary homiletical reflection.

Secondly, as Chapter 2 noted, existing theological reflection on preaching lacks a unified theological center. Examples of insight-theological reflection were seen to produce helpful pieces of reflection on what preaching is, yet were often unconcerned with how those discrete insights fit into a larger ideological structure reflecting the entire canon of Scripture. The concept of viceregency enhances homiletical reflection here as well, for it provides a synthesizing idea, theological in focus, which allows for and orders the discrete insights brought from other homiletical reflection. The concept of viceregency, therefore, allows

the viceregal homiletic to unify its reflection on preaching in a way that contemporary homiletical reflection in the theological mode has not done thus far.

Thus, the concept of the preacher being a viceregent marks the viceregal homiletic as theological reflection on preaching, for it centralizes the idea that the preacher should be scrutinized vis-à-vis the Christian God. In addition, the concept of viceregency provides a unified theological center for homiletical reflection.

This Chapter's Purpose

As noted above, the viceregal homiletic particularizes for homiletical reflection Beale's idea that all Christians are viceregents. The viceregal homiletic states that the preacher is a Christian viceregent: a Christian who, through the work of Christ, expresses God's rule over the creation. This chapter will present and engage critically Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency in order to differentiate it from other understandings of viceregency. This discussion will clarify how the viceregal homiletic extendsBeale's work.

Critiquing Childsian Beale

Chapter 3 suggested that Beale's work has characteristics of a Childsian biblical-theological process. Aspects of Beale's discussions exhibit what might be called a subjunctive mode, and Chapter 3 argued that Beale may, at these times, be proceeding in what Brevard Childs has called the "theological task of the Biblical theologian." In this task, relative exegetical certainty has already been established, and the theologian is revisiting and grouping together texts to consider how Scripture resonates when read from a Christocentric perspective. This theological task of the theologian involves bringing the divine demands of Scripture to bear on the present; the Childsian theological method concludes, as it were, in a chapel, listening for the contemporary voice of God speaking to the Church.

With this in mind, Chapter 3 suggested that Beale's penchant for citing several texts and then stating that they "likely" or "probably" interrelate is not a liability, but symptomatic of a benefit that his theological reflection offers the contemporary Church. Beale's project could be understood as an exercise to "extend through figuration,"[7] responsibly and faithfully, aspects of the Scriptural witness relevant to the Church's contemporary ministry. That is, the project seems more to be working towards a coherent and fresh articulation of the Lordship of Jesus Christ in the contemporary world than simply a historical-critical proposal for what Scripture meant in its original context.

Yet Beale's suggestive mode seems difficult to penetrate at points. How can a fruitful critique of Beale proceed, in this case a critique of his understanding of Christian viceregency, that is not merely sifting through his hundreds of proposed intertextualities, asserting, at certain points, unlikelihood rather than likelihood? Further, how can such a critique proceed if, as Chapter 3 has suggested, these amassed intertextual connections, though sometimes uncertain, represent an advantage of Beale's work rather than a disadvantage? This chapter responds to this question by shifting the focus of its critique.

When Beale's reflection engages historical-critical exegesis, it is open to critique on historical-critical grounds. Discussions of this type, however, are ongoing and manifold; Beale anticipated several of them in footnotes of *A New Testament Biblical Theology*.[8] Yet even if an exhaustive critical accounting of each of Beale's exegetical decisions were to be produced, it would fail to capture, and therefore to address critically, a key aspect of Beale's project: Beale's goal is to use Scripture to make sense of God and the Church today; he hopes that "readers can glean theological principles with a view to living as faithful Christians…"[9]

---

7. Brevard S. Childs, *Biblical Theology: A Proposal* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 2002) 70f.

8. E.g. Gregory K. Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011) 445fn20, 577fn66, 671fn56.

9. Beale, *NTBT*, 25.

The project is not strictly academic.[10] To critique only each exegetical decision of Beale's project seems comparable to critiquing, one by one, the bricks in a stadium while avoiding critical examination, or even acknowledgement, of the stadium itself.

As William Klein, one of Beale's critics, has illustrated,[11] the broader structure and conclusions of Beale's project opens questions in the realm of systematic theology. Beale does not develop his project according to categories from systematic theology, though he refers to them from time to time.[12] Our chapter's discussion of Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency assumes Klein's observation to be accurate, and will therefore seek to differentiate Beale's conclusions about contemporary Christian life and ministry vis-à-vis existing theological reflection both biblical and systematic. To this end, the chapter will examine and critique four key ideas from Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency, finding their proximity to other theological reflection. After each key idea is critiqued in this way, the chapter will briefly show how each of the four key ideas informs the viceregal homiletic's summative statements about preaching.

The following discussion will therefore leave extensive treatment of Beale's exegetical and intertextual work to others, and will instead locate critically the key ideas of Beale's understanding of viceregency and their implications for reflection on Christian preaching.

With this in mind, the four key ideas within Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency are:

---

10. Beale, *NTBT*, 25. Cf. 961f.

11. "...is this book really a 'systematic' theology after all?" William W. Klein, "*A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New*. A Denver Journal Review by Denver Seminary professor William W. Klein," *Denver Journal* 16 (Jul 12, 2013), accessed August 16, 2018, https://denverseminary.edu/resources/ news-and-articles/a-new-testament-biblical-theology-the-unfolding-of-the-old-testament-in-the-new/.

12. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 42fn39; 43fn45.

1) Adam's identity "in the image of God" is congruent with Adam's mission "to rule over and subdue."
2) Christians today identify with Jesus Christ, who is the one true viceregent.
3) Adam's mission was intended to expand Eden.
4) Adam's mission would be eschatologically completed.

Christian Viceregency According to Beale

An articulated purpose of Beale's *A New Testament Biblical Theology* is to show that each part of Scripture fits into an overall storyline[13] and to explain how parts of the Church's contemporary experience correspond to the overall storyline. In this, Beale's work is similar to the work of contemporary biblical theologians like Thomas Schreiner[14] and Stephen Dempster,[15] who organize their biblical-theological projects around a proposed storyline rather than themes. For Beale, the intended result here is a "synthetic formulation about God's purposes in creation, fall, redemption, and consummation" which sums up the entire Bible.[16] Due to this choice of method, his *A New Testament Biblical Theology* is not arranged canonically, for the stages through which the narrative develops often are not ordered the same as the books of the canon.[17]

Pertinent to the current discussion, a central topic that runs throughout Beale's storyline is the hope for a restored human viceregency: an Adamic king of the new creation reigning in the name of God on earth.[18] This is implicit in Beale's summaries of the Old and New Testament storylines, and explicit in how

13. Beale, *NTBT*, 15f.

14. Thomas R. Schreiner, *The King in His Beauty: A Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic 2013).

15. Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Biblical Theology of the Hebrew Bible* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2006).

16. Beale, *NTBT*, 5.

17. Beale, *NTBT*, 14.

18. Beale, *NTBT*, 63.

he defends and develops those storylines with data from Genesis 1-3 and the rest of the canon.[19]

Summary Narrative of Beale's Viceregency

Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency interconnects with the whole of his lengthy *A New Testament Biblical Theology*. Its essential characteristics, however, seem to grow from Genesis 1-3. Beale holds that Genesis 1-3 introduces the narrative which develops through the Old Testament, reaches its fulfillment in Jesus Christ, and continues describing reality today.[20] This narrative can be summarized as follows:

Humanity's creation in the image of God means that they are the viceregents of God's creation: "Adam and Eve and their progeny were to be vice-regents who were to act as God's obedient children, reflecting God's ultimate glorious kingship over the earth."[21] This responsibility, which Beale terms "Adam's commission" was passed on to all of humanity.[22] Through an extensive tracing of phrases from "Adam's commission" spoken by God to Old Testament biblical characters, Beale suggests that this Adamic commission was to be pursued by Adam, Noah, the patriarchs, the leaders of Israel, and the nation of Israel as a whole.[23] None of these pursuits ultimately succeeded.[24] Beale argues that the Old Testament's anticipation of a Messiah connected integrally with the idea that "eschatological Israel and their end-time king will finally succeed in fully accomplishing the Adamic commission."[25] An enduring and unresolved theme of the Old Testament, then, is God's intent for a human, mirroring Adam in Eden, to rule over and subdue the earth.[26]

---

19. Beale, *NTBT*, 16.
20. Beale, *NTBT*, 29.
21. Beale, *NTBT*, 37.
22. Beale, *NTBT*, 46.
23. Beale, *NTBT*, 45-51.
24. Beale, *NTBT*, 917.
25. Beale, *NTBT*, 50.
26. Beale, *NTBT*, 88-116.

Considering the New Testament, Beale writes that the advent of Jesus marked the beginning of humanity's reinstatement to this viceregal role. Jesus Christ's life, death, and resurrection inaugurate and exemplify this reinstatement of human viceregal presence.[27] Christ's miracles represent his victory over Satan and the powers of nature, and "represent in part a reversal of the original curse on the first Adam for his disobedience."[28] The entirety of Christ's life on earth Beale views as an example of the image of God, and therefore Christ's kingship, being correctly functionalized.[29] Jesus's death and resurrection further this. "[Christ's] resurrected body was the literal beginning of the latter-day new creation and his obedient reign in that new creation."[30]

Through the Holy Spirit,[31] the Church experiences and participates in Christ's restoration of human viceregal rule over the earth.[32] The Church receives a renewed Adamic viceregency because of its identification with the crucifixion, resurrection, and ascension of Jesus.[33] Through this identification, the Holy Spirit revivifies the image of God in redeemed humans,[34] and thus moves towards Genesis 1-3's hope of a creation ruled in God's name by human viceregents. This fulfillment will be complete at Christ's return, but is now active in creation in an inaugurated eschatological manner because of the enthronement of Jesus at the Father's right hand.[35]

Christ's enthronement in heaven manifests in the Spirit-empowered activities of the Church on earth.[36] Christians today therefore participate in and forward the "inaugurated end-times new creation," of which the risen Jesus is the

---

27. Beale, *NTBT*, 427.
28. Beale, *NTBT*, 427.
29. Beale, *NTBT*, 427.
30. Beale, *NTBT*, 479.
31. Beale, *NTBT*, 559-613.
32. Beale, *NTBT*, 651-749.
33. Beale, *NTBT*, 308-310.
34. Beale, *NTBT*, 913-916.
35. Beale, *NTBT*, 916.
36. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 893f, 914.

viceregent.[37] Beale connects Sabbath-keeping,[38] the sacraments,[39] church discipline,[40] and preaching[41] to the Church's participation in the viceregency of Jesus, though he also implies that all redeemed activities of Christians fall under the category of living according to the Spirit, and therefore participating in the viceregency of Jesus over the creation.[42]

Thus, these actions – of Jesus, of the Church, and of individual Christians – are, according to Beale, best understood in light of Adam's creation and original mission in Eden. For Beale, Christians today function as redeemed Adams. This, in summary, is Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency.

Though this restoration of human viceregency in Christ is a facet of what Beale sees as the unifying storyline of Scripture, his theological project is not centered on the subject of viceregency. *A New Testament Biblical Theology* is not itself a defense of the idea. Rather, it seems that as Beale illustrates how the various parts of Scripture weave together into a coherent story, Christ's restoration of human viceregency over the earth emerges as a unifying, continuing part of the narrative of how God ultimately receives glory.

The following sections will discuss and critique four key ideas integral to Beale's unique understanding of Christian viceregency. These key ideas are:

1) Adam's identity "in the image of God" is congruent with Adam's mission "to rule over and subdue."
2) Christians today identify with Jesus Christ, the one true viceregent.
3) Adam's mission was intended to expand Eden.
4) Adam's mission would be eschatologically completed.

---

37. Beale, *NTBT*, 962.
38. Beale, *NTBT*, 923.
39. Beale, *NTBT*, 924-928.
40. Beale, *NTBT*, 929-932.
41. Beale, *NTBT*, 962.
42. Beale, *NTBT*, 961f.

Beale does not list these four ideas together, yet as the following discussion will show, they form integral pieces of his understanding of Christian viceregency, and therefore serve as effective points to differentiate it from other understandings of viceregency over creation.

The first key idea, then, is that Adam's mission "to rule over" creation and his identity "in the image of God" are congruent.

Key Idea One: Adam's Identity is Congruent with His Mission

For Beale, Adam's identity, one made "in the image of God," corresponds with his mission to "be fruitful…fill the earth and subdue it." According to Beale, Adam's commission in Genesis 1:26-28 is a central piece of Genesis 1-3.

> Then God said, "Let us make man in our image, in our likeness, and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, over the livestock, over all the earth, and over all the creatures that move along the ground." So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them. God blessed them and said to them, "Be fruitful and increase in number; fill the earth and subdue it. Rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air and over every living creature that moves on the ground."

Per Beale, this text describes both who Adam is and what he is to do. Adam's charge to rule over the earth is presented alongside his creation in the image of God.[43] It is this identity "in the image" which, according to Beale, "enables Adam to carry out the particular parts of the commission."[44] The tasks mentioned by the text, being fruitful and multiplying, filling the earth, subduing the earth, and ruling over the earth, are "part of a functional definition of the divine image in which Adam was made."[45] Beale views them as the behavioral results intended to flow from Adam's being made in the image. However, relatedly Beale sees that this "functional definition of the divine image" is complemented by "an additional ontological aspect of the 'image' by which humanity was enabled to reflect the

43. Beale, *NTBT*, 30.
44. Beale, *NTBT*, 30.
45. Beale, *NTBT*, 30.

functional image."[46] So, what Adam was to do was "enabled" by who Adam was. Beale's reading of Genesis 1:26-28 thus interrelates Adam's identity and function.

Beale explains this interconnection of Adam's identity and function in Genesis 1-3 by showing how the ancient near eastern concept of "image" illuminates the text's understanding of Adam.[47] He notes that in the ancient near east the king was understood to be an image of a god; the king ruled and subdued in the name of the god whose image he was.[48] "Kings imaging gods was part of the institution of kingship itself…"[49] The human king was seen as a living image, or idol, of the god: "the place through which the god manifested his presence and conveyed his blessings."[50] According to Beale, this concept underpins the historical examples of kings in the ancient near east setting up images, or statues, of themselves in conquered territories.[51]

Beale inflects from this cultural backdrop as he interprets Adam's identity and function. He writes that Genesis 1 presenting humanity as created "in the image of God" implies that God is similarly asserting his reign over the earth; "God setting up Adam as his image on the territory of the earth…represents God's sovereign presence and rule."[52]

For Beale, Adam was commanded to perform these activities in a manner that would reflect the prior activities of God. God had, after creating all things, overcome chaos, ruled over it, and filled the creation with animate life, ordering

---

46. Beale, *NTBT*, 32.

47. Beale, *NTBT*, 30.

48. Beale, *NTBT*, 30.

49. Irene J. Winter, "Art in Empire: The Royal Image and the Visual Dimensions of Assyrian Ideology," in Assyria 1995: Proceedings of the 10th Anniversary Symposium of the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, Helsinki, September 7-11, 1995, ed. S. Parpola and R.M. Whiting (Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1997) 372. Quoted in Beale, *NTBT*, 31.

50. Beale, *NTBT*, 30.

51. Beale, *NTBT*, 32.

52. Beale, *NTBT*, 32. Beale quotes Middleton, who observes that saying that all humanity is created "in the image of God" represents "a genuine democratization of ancient near eastern royal ideology." J. Richard Middleton, *The Liberating Image: The Imago Dei in Genesis 1* (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2005) 108-111.

the realms of light, land, and animals by naming key constituents therein.[53] These are the kinds of actions which, as he imaged, Adam was to copy and continue: overcoming the chaos invited by the serpent, ruling over the animals, filling creation with obedient image-bearers, and naming the creatures within creation. Per Beale, Genesis 2 reflects this pattern, with God planting Eden and then placing Adam therein to cultivate it.[54] Adam was continuing what God had done. In these ways, Beale understands obedient human action to image God functionally on earth.

For Beale, Adam would not only represent God by his physical presence, but also by his physical actions. What Adam did would functionalize his image identity; he would image God through righteous behavior. Ruling over and subduing all the earth was an obedient act which expressed Adam's identity as king and therefore God's rule over the earth.[55] God's rule would also be manifested in Adam's obedience to the divine command to "be fruitful and multiply…rule over the earth and subdue it" (Genesis 1:26-28). Populating the earth with God-imaging human offspring would fill the earth with other humans, each yet another sign of God's reign over the creation.[56]

But further developing the idea that Adam is in God's "image," according to Beale, Adam was created to image God internally as well as externally. Fulfilling the Adamic commission by physically fulfilling God's commands presupposed an unseen obedience and moral order within Adam. "Adam was made in the volitional, rational, and moral image of God, so that [regarding the moral aspect], he was to reflect moral attributes such as righteousness, knowledge, holiness, justice, love, faithfulness, integrity…and above all was to

---

53. Beale, *NTBT*, 32. He here cites Warren Austin Gage's *Gospel of Genesis* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Carpenter Books, 1984) 27-36.

54. Beale, *NTBT*, 32.

55. Beale, *NTBT*, 30.

56. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity, 2004) 82.

reflect God's glory."[57] For Beale, Adam was to be, act, and think like God. Beale writes, "[t]hus, the focus of the divine image in Adam in Genesis 1-2 is on how Adam's activities copy God's, though there is the underlying assumption that Adam was created with attributes that were reflective of God's attributes."[58]

Thus, in Beale's reading of Genesis 1-3, Adam's identity as "in the image of God" interconnects and cooperates with his commission stated in 1:26-28. Just as an ancient near eastern king might erect a statue of himself in a conquered land, to remind its inhabitants of his rule and power, Adam was set over the creation "in the image of God" to display God's rule over the earth. Yet unlike a statue, Adam was not a dead image. His obedience to God's commands would physically enact God's rule over the earth, and these physical actions would themselves correlate with Adam's inner dispositions aligning with the divine will.

Thus, Beale presents the nature of humanity as thoroughly congruent with the Adamic commission, and vice versa. As our discussion continues to outline Beale's understanding of viceregency, an initial insight seems to be emerging: Beale views fulfilling the Adamic commission as conceptually inextricable from being created in the image of God, that is, of being a human. Viceregal rule is connected to being a human, and vice versa. No other creature besides humans are able to be viceregents, and no human is not a viceregent.

Two additional pieces of Beale's biblical-theological reflection seem further to confirm this as his understanding.

First, a large portion of Beale's explanation of Jesus Christ's significance relates to Christ being the image of God, and therefore representing God, and God's reign, on earth.[59] This, writes Beale, is explicitly taught in Paul's epistles and is implied in the gospels.[60] He observes that "an examination of Jesus as the

57. Beale, *NTBT*, 32.
58. Beale, *NTBT*, 32.
59. Beale, *NTBT*, 444-446.
60. Beale, *NTBT*, 386.

last Adam in the Synoptic gospels is one way of obtaining conceptually the evangelists' picture of him as the flawless image of God on earth."[61] Based on this, Beale views Jesus's human actions as fulfilling the Adamic commission, calling those actions "Christ's Adamic rule."[62] Jesus Christ exhibits both the identity and intended function of humans, which Beale describes in terms of this key idea from Genesis 1-3: being made in the image of God corresponds with fulfilling the commission to rule over the earth.

Second, Beale connects Christians' contemporary ability to fulfill the Adamic commission to the image of God being restored in them.[63] Per Beale, the Holy Spirit's redemption of sinful humans involves a revivification of the image of God,[64] and thus fulfills the hope, inherent in Genesis 1-2 and present throughout the Old Testament, of a creation ruled in God's name by human viceregents.[65] Unredeemed humans suffer from the image of God being marred within them.[66] The redeemed, however, exhibit a revivification of their imaging as they share in Christ's perfect imaging of God. This is manifested particularly in their repentant and obedient lives,[67] through which the Adamic commission goes forward.[68]

In both of these pieces of Beale's biblical-theological reflection, the image of God is congruent with the Adamic commission.

To review, then, the first key idea in Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency is that Adam's identity, made "in the image of God," is congruent with his commission to "rule over" the creation. Beale holds that the form and nature of humanity is congruent with what God commanded Adam to do. The

---

61. Beale, *NTBT*, 386.
62. Beale, *NTBT*, 386.
63. Beale, *NTBT*, 914-920, esp. 919.
64. Beale, *NTBT*, 913-916.
65. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 142-144.
66. Beale, *NTBT*, 456.
67. Beale, *NTBT*, 961f.
68. Beale, *NTBT*, 913.

way Beale describes Jesus Christ's unique identity as the image of God who fulfills the Adamic commission illustrates this interconnection in his reflection. In addition, Beale sees the redemption that Christians receive as renewing the image of God within them, and therefore restoring the Church, through Christ, to an Adamic identity and function.

Yet what other Christian theologians write similarly of Adam's rule over the creation? And what does this key idea have to do with the viceregal homiletic's reflection on preaching?

Analysis and Critique

Within the variety of interpretations regarding the image of God,[69] the idea that the image of God is connected to Adam's commission to rule over the earth has significant historical precedents in the Christian theological tradition. According to Alister McGrath, Genesis 1:27 is "a text of central importance to a Christian understanding of human nature."[70] McGrath continues:

> The Christian tradition, basing itself largely upon the accounts of creation found in the Book of Genesis, has insisted that humanity is the height of God's creation, set over and above the animal kingdom. The theological justification of this rests largely upon the doctrine of creation in the image of God…[71]

McGrath's observation here is that Christian reflection upon the place of humans in the world – "over and above the animal kingdom" – has been rooted in Genesis 1 and 2's account of creation, and particularly the statement that humans are made in the image of God. McGrath's discussion of patristic reflection on the image of God[72] demonstrates that from an early date the Christian tradition has

---

69. E.g. Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology: An Introduction*, 3rd ed. (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001) 440-442.

70. Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology*, 440.

71. Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology*, 440.

72. Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology*, 441-443.

linked discussions of the image of God to discussions of how sin and redemption affect the human person.[73]

If McGrath's analysis here is accurate, Beale's observations about the image of God are generally congruent with how the Christian tradition has considered the image of God, for Beale not only discusses what being in the image means for Adam,[74] but what redemption of the image in the people of God entails.[75] Initially, then, this key idea seems generally accepted by the Christian tradition.

Yet this general congruence only begins to focus on the key idea currently at hand: that Adam being made in the image corresponds with his commission to rule over the earth. A closer examination reveals that Beale's reflection here exhibits significant overlap with systematic theological reflection of 20th century Dutch Calvinism. Though Beale's works rarely cite authors such as Anthony Hoekema, G.C. Berkouwer, Herman Bavinck, Hendrickus Berkhof, or Louis Berkhof, it seems clear that Beale's biblical-theological reflection comes to similar, if not the same, conclusions regarding what "in the image of God" means.

Anthony Hoekema's 1986 book, *Created in God's Image*, frequently mirrors and incorporates the structure and content of Herman Bavinck,[76] G.C. Berkouwer,[77] and Louis Berkhof's[78] reflection on the same topic.[79] For this reason, Hoekema's book not only demonstrates a wide scope of agreement between these scholars within the Dutch Calvinist tradition, but provides a

---

73. Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology*, 442.

74. Beale, *NTBT*, 29-87, esp. 30-43.

75. Beale, *NTBT*, 427-429, esp. 429.

76. E.g. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, reprint ed. (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans: 1994) 82-85; see also 258.

77. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 258.

78. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 75fn21; see also 258.

79. The dependence of these latter writers on the earlier Bavinck explains a great measure of their similarity. Cf. Richard Muller re: Bavinck's influence on L. Berkhof in Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology: New Combined Edition* with a new preface by Richard A. Muller (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996) vi.

helpful conversation partner with which to bring Beale's work on this point into dialogue. How, exactly, is Beale's view of the image of God similar to the Dutch Calvinists whom Hoekema's book represents?

Hoekema's book aims to "set forth what the Bible teaches about the nature and destiny of human beings."[80] Towards that end, the first hundred pages, nearly 40% of the work, consists of biblical and historical surveys and then Hoekema's "theological summary" of the concept of the image of God. Hoekema's theological discussions concerning sin, imputation, and redemption fill the remainder of the book.[81] Pertinent to our current discussion, Hoekema comments on how theologians have connected the concept of the image of God to the concept of Adam ruling. He observes:

> Theologians…have differed over the significance of [Adam's] ruling. Some have thought of this dominion as only a side effect of man's having been created in the image of God, not as an essential aspect of the image. Most interpreters, however, have believed…that man's having been given dominion over the earth is an essential aspect of the image of God. As God is revealed in Genesis 1 as ruling over the whole creation, so man is pictured here as God's vicegerent…He is not to be thought of apart from this dominion, any more than he should be thought of apart from his relationship to God or to his fellow human beings.[82]

Hoekema here divides theologians into a smaller group which sees Adam's dominion "as only a side effect" of his being made in the image of God, and a larger group which has held "that man's having been given dominion over the earth is an essential aspect of the image of God."[83] Hoekema's discussion then

---

80. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, ix.

81. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, vii.

82. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 78f.

83. Hoekema cites Skinner, Gunkel, Calvin, and Berkouwer among those who hold Adam's dominion to be a "side effect," and Luther, Laidlaw, Bavinck, Vander Zanden, Berkhof, Verduin, and Cairns among those who hold Adam's dominion to be "an essential aspect of the image." Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 78fn29.

moves in the direction of the larger group, and seems particularly indebted to Herman Bavinck and Louis Berkhof.[84]

Beale falls also into the second group Hoekema describes. In general, Beale rarely discusses Adam apart from his dominion, or, to use Beale's terminology, Adam's rule[85] or kingship,[86] over the earth.[87] This is evident, for example, in Beale's discussions of how Adam's creation fundamentally evokes the ancient near eastern understanding of "image,"[88] an idea which appears also in Hoekema's reflection.[89] Also pertinent on this point is Beale's openness to describing the work of Jesus Christ summarily as "Christ's Adamic rule,"[90] for it implies that everything Christ did was an exertion of Adamic rule over creation.

Beale, like Hoekema, does not see Adam or Jesus apart from Adamic rule. He sees ruling as the essential part of who Adam and Jesus are; for Beale, Adam's identity and mission are entirely congruent. What is surprising, however, is the fact that Beale does not directly argue this. The way he describes Adam and Jesus clearly implies that there is no part of humanity that should be viewed outside of Genesis 1:26-28's lens, and there is a sense in which his entire project rests upon this detail. From a systematic theological perspective, this lacuna in Beale's discussion is a fundamental and critical vulnerability. If a reader were to take the minority position, according to Hoekema, that Adam's ruling described in Genesis 1:26-28 only describes part of who a human is, much of Beale's project would immediately be thrown into question.

---

84. *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. "viceregency."

85. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 34-36.

86. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 30f, 80, 893.

87. Beale uses the term "dominion" less frequently than "rule" or "kingship." E.g. 36, 56, 109.

88. Beale, *NTBT*, 32.

89. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 67.

90. Beale, *NTBT*, 386. See also "Jesus as End-Time Adamic King…Who Recovers the Image of God," Beale, *NTBT*, 427-429.

However, Beale's discussion does throw Hoekema's description of the image of God into question as well. Hoekema describes "the image of God" in terms of "a threefold relationship."[91] "God has placed man into a threefold relationship: between man and God, between man and his fellowman, and between man and nature."[92] To be a human being is to be "directed towards God," "directed towards one's fellowmen," and "to rule over nature."[93] Hoekema asserts that different eras of history have emphasized one to the detriment of the other two.[94] In response, he claims that "God has placed man into all three relationships."[95] Each is "indispensable," none can operate without the others, and all three are "interrelated."[96]

Though this Dutch Calvinist model of threefold relationship reflects well the witness of Scripture regarding Adam's placement in the creation, Hoekema could be more clear on how each of the three areas interconnect. His summary[97] revisits this idea of threefold relationship three times[98] and, pertinent for our current discussion, Hoekema skirts mentioning how Adam's relationship with God and Adam's relationship with other humans are affected by Adam's "dominion over nature."[99] Hoekema infers that Adam's dominion over nature is affected by the other two areas, yet does not indicate how Adam's capacity for dominion is "indespensible"[100] to the other two relationships. On this point it seems that Hoekema has fallen victim to his own prior critique by emphasizing the importance of the first two for the third, but not the third's importance for

---

91. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 75. He credits Hendrickus Berkhof on 81fn31.

92. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 75.

93. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 75-78.

94. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 80.

95. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 81.

96. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 81.

97. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 66-101.

98. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 84-85, 86-88, 93-95.

99. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 80-82, esp. 80.

100. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 81.

the first two. Thus, though Hoekema seems to lay the groundwork for an explanation of how Adam "should not be thought of apart from" his rule over the earth,[101] his reflection does not fully explain this statement. He does not discuss how Adam's rulership shapes his relationship to God and his relationships with other humans.

Beale's reflection on this point better exhibits how Adamic rule affects, to use Hoekema's terms, the "God-man" relationship and the "man-man" relationship. In short, Beale portrays the redemption of these two relationships as the central exertion of Christ's Adamic kingship. Per Beale, Christ's death was an act of ruling over Satan[102] which concomitantly released the people of God from the power of Satan[103] and freed them to enter God's presence in heaven.[104] In Beale's work, then, the vicarious death of Christ is an instrument which redeems the "God-man" relationship and the "man-man" relationship through an act of Adamic rule "over nature": the overthrow of the deceiving serpent.[105]

This is one way Beale's work implies a more integrated understanding of how Adam "should not be thought of apart from"[106] his rule[107] though, as noted above, his discussion could more directly address this key idea in his understanding of Christian viceregency.

But how does this first key idea from Beale inform the viceregal homiletic's central idea that the preacher is a Christian viceregent? What does Adam's image identity correlating with his commission have to do with preaching?

---

101. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 79.
102. Beale, *NTBT*, 907.
103. Beale, *NTBT*, 900f.
104. Beale, *NTBT*, 902.
105. Beale, *NTBT*, 217f, 420-422.
106. Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 79.
107. Beale, *NTBT*, 401-437.

Summative Statements About Preaching

This first key idea produces two summative statements about preaching.

First, such a congruence of Adam's mission and identity creates an implication about the nature of humanity, and therefore of the preacher. Humans, according to this key idea from Beale, are reflectors of God and God's glory, intended to serve as living reminders of God's dominion over the earth. All human existence and action shares this essential characteristic. This implies that preachers, because they are renewed in their imaging function, are living reminders of God's dominion over the earth. Thus, *preaching images God; it is a sign of his rule and presence on earth.*

Secondly, such a congruence of Adam's mission and identity creates an implication about the character of human action, and therefore of the act of preaching. The character of human action is to exhibit God's rule over the earth by mimicking and continuing God's prior actions, bringing rule and order to the creation. Specifically, just as God had overcome chaos, ruled over it, and filled the creation with animate life, Adam was to overcome the chaos invited by the serpent, rule over the animals, and fill creation with obedient image-bearers.[108] Similarly, Christ's preaching and miracles manifested the present reign of God by ruling and ordering creation.

With this in mind, preaching emerges as a human, viceregal action which images God's ruling and ordering on earth. Preaching mimics and continues, in a general fashion, all of God's prior actions. More specifically, preaching extends God's work in Jesus Christ; it is a continuation of the work God is currently doing in creation through Jesus: subduing Satanic chaos, ruling over the beasts, and filling creation with obedient image-bearers.

This key idea from Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency highlights a deep congruence between the purposes of God and the identity and

108. Beale, *NTBT*, 32.

actions of a redeemed human person. Because of their redeemed imaging status, Christians can act righteously in ways that further the kingdom priorities of God; in this they touch what true humanity is. Preaching involves a human functionalizing the redemption he has received, a redemption which does not remove him from creation, but which aligns him with his viceregal role within it. Preaching, then, is not an act which eclipses the humanity of the preacher, nor any of his alignments with God or creation. Rather, it ushers the preacher towards the fullness of redeemed humanity in Jesus Christ, and therefore integrates him in creation in an unprecedented manner.

The preacher's actions and words work concurrently with the power and intent of God, to fill creation with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord. Redemption has created within the Christian preacher a deep congruence with the image of God, such that his words and actions can adhere to the purposes of God. The preacher preaching therefore has the capability to speak truth. Further, he may speak truth with integrity; it is possible for his entire person, within and without, to align with his words spoken from God and about God. The redeemed human, then, is ideally suited for the task of preaching, and preaching is ideally suited for a redeemed human. Far from being something which requires the preacher to renounce or eclipse his humanness for the sake of representing God, *preaching is a human act which expands the reign of God.*

Our discussion so far has touched on the first of four key ideas from Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency, the idea that Adam's identity "in the image of God" is congruent with his mission, and has isolated two of the viceregal homiletic's summative statements about preaching:

1. Preaching images God; it is a sign of his rule and presence on earth.
2. Preaching is a human act which expands the reign of God.

We now move onto a second key idea of Beale's Christian viceregency.

Key Idea Two: Christians Identify with Christ, the One Viceregent

The second key idea in Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency is that Christians identify with Jesus Christ, who is the one true viceregent.

Though the terminology of "identification" occurs throughout *A New Testament Biblical Theology*,[109] Beale offers no succinct, comprehensive definition of what "identifying with Christ" means. The one heading that does mention identification[110] begins a section that involves the concept, though obliquely. The ultimate effect is that identification is mentioned disparately throughout the book, yet seems fundamentally to influence the whole.

An initial survey of places where the book refers to believers "identifying" with Christ seems clearly to indicate that identifying with Christ involves having faith in him. This seems particularly clear when, in a moment discussing John 3:11-16, Beale adds a parenthetical comment in his quotation of the Scripture: "whoever believes in [identifies with] Him shall not perish, but have eternal life."[111] At some fundamental level, then, it seems that for Beale, "believing in Jesus" is synonymous with "identifying with Jesus" or "identify with Jesus by faith."[112]

Yet more specificity is needed, and additional scrutiny does produce it. During Beale's engagement with the book of Colossians, he comments:

> Note the readers' "faith in Christ" (Col. 1:4), which has caused them to be identified with Christ…and even united with him… The theme of

---

109. E.g. sections where believers' identification with Christ and/or particular benefits of Christ's work in are mentioned Beale, *NTBT*, 141, 151, 153, 154, 208, 223, 227, 248, 285, 307, 320, 335, 349, 354fn107, 357, 386, 412, 423, 426, 441, 496, 500, 514, 547, 576, 577, 652, 653, 657, 671, 677, 681, 710, 715, 722, 739, 749, 762, 766, 772, 790, 798, 809, 814, 845, 899, 906, 909, 913, 915, 921, 922, 935.

110. "Jesus as the Adamic Son Who Represents Those Who Identify with Him as Sons." Beale, *NTBT*, 423-427.

111. Beale, *NTBT*, 335.

112. Beale, *NTBT*, 141, 285, 307, "believe in" 335, 426.

> their identification with Christ as their representative continues in 1:22, 24, 27, 28; 2:6, 10-13, 19; 3:1, 3-4, 10.[113]

Here Beale uses "identified with Christ" in parallel with "united with him." It seems that Beale means to illumine the facet of a Christian's identity that comes from God seeing the believer as Christ or in Christ. Alongside the prior insight regarding "identify" being equated with having faith in Christ, it seems clear that Beale has a staple concept from Christian theology in view: by faith, Christians are united with Christ and experience the benefits of his resurrection.

This seems true in light of other places Beale refers to identification, and particularly in the way he combines it with other concepts. Beale uses a variety of terms, both Scriptural and theological, to describe a spectrum of aspects of Jesus's life and ministry with which Christians "identify." For example, he describes Christians as those who "identify" with "Jesus as the true Israel,"[114] "Christ as the last Adam,"[115] the "trials of Jesus,"[116] Jesus's "faithful witness,"[117] the "death and resurrection" of Jesus,[118] "the resurrected and ascended Jesus,"[119] "Christ's redemption,"[120] Christ's "conquering,"[121] Christ's "kingdom,"[122] Jesus's "resurrected kingship,"[123] and "Christ's Adamic kingship."[124]

This wide spectrum of terms describing to whom or what Christians identify is a result, in part, of the breadth of Beale's project. *A New Testament Biblical Theology* and, to a certain extent, Beale's *The Temple and the Church's*

---

113. Beale, *NTBT*, 285fn69.
114. Beale, *NTBT*, 151, similarly "Abraham's promised seed" 307, 424.
115. Beale, *NTBT*, 386.
116. Beale, *NTBT*, 208, "the Lamb's death [and] also the Lamb's resurrection life" 349.
117. Beale, *NTBT*, 223.
118. Beale, *NTBT*, 154, "resurrection" 357, 514, 547, 762.
119. Beale, *NTBT*, 320.
120. Beale, *NTBT*, 153.
121. Beale, *NTBT*, 349.
122. Beale, *NTBT*, 349.
123. Beale, *NTBT*, 576.
124. Beale, *TCM*, 396f.

Mission, reflect Beale's attempt to connect or relate all of Scripture to a central storyline.[125] This involves a broad synthetic process to incorporate different Scriptural authors who use different terminology and analogies to describe a believer's relationship with God through Christ. Beale's spectrum of terms therefore seems probable and justifiable, though his discussion might have been improved by simply stating his understanding of identification.

If this is an accurate reading of Beale's "identification," it also seems consistent with his articulated storyline of the New Testament,[126] as well as his expressed desire to organize his entire theological project around Christ's resurrection.[127] Based on this evidence, it seems legitimate at this point to suggest that "identification with Christ" in Beale's work is synonymous with being united with Christ and experiencing the benefits of his resurrection.

But why is this understanding of identification important for Beale's Christian viceregency?

An initial answer to this question seems to be that without "identifying" with Christ, Christians have no way, conceptually nor actually, of participating in Christ's viceregal role over the creation. Beale's concept of Christian identification corresponds with his conviction that only Jesus Christ, as the image of God, begins to fulfill the Adamic commission. Jesus is the only viceregent of creation. Unredeemed humans do not, per se, image God as intended, and so a human must "identify" with Christ to partake in the Adamic viceregal office.

Thus, Beale's "identification" plays a key role in his understanding of Christian viceregency, for through identification the Church partakes in Christ's viceregal reinvestiture and rule over the creation. This brings our discussion to how Beale sees Jesus as the one, true Adamic viceregent.

---

125. Cf. Beale, *NTBT*, 24.

126. Beale, *NTBT*, 16.

127. Beale, *NTBT*, 21-23.

Beale presents Jesus as the only human whose identity and actions are entirely congruent with Adam's commission.[128] Jesus's earthly ministry, death, and especially resurrection[129] perfectly reflected and exercised God's holy rule on earth.[130] Jesus is therefore a second Adam who inaugurates the kingdom of the new creation.[131] He alone is the perfect viceregent. As mentioned, Beale portrays Christ's death and resurrection as the central exertion of Christ's Adamic kingship. Per Beale, Christ's death was an act of ruling over Satan[132] which concomitantly released the people of God from the power of Satan[133] and freed them to enter God's presence in heaven.[134]

Beale's discussion of Jesus as viceregent spans his *A New Testament Biblical Theology*. The following discussion will visit five different facets of Beale's key idea that Jesus is the paradigmatic viceregent of creation: a) Christ the Old Testament "son of God", b) Christ the king who images God, c) Christ the "son of man", d) Christ as obedient in temptation, and e) Christ the keeper and filler of creation.

a) Christ the Old Testament "son of God"

Per Beale, the Old Testament's concept of "image of God" is linked to sonship.[135] According to Genesis 5:3, a son is the image of his father. Jesus is a son of God, then, like Adam (Gen. 1:26-28), for he is the image of God. Further, though, Beale observes that the Old Testament prophets looked to a time when Israel would worship and obey in purity, when Israel would be an obedient son. As "son of God" then, Jesus sums up Israel in himself, and by retracing Israel's

128. Beale, *NTBT*, 401-437.
129. Beale, *NTBT*, 354.
130. Beale, *NTBT*, 460.
131. Beale, *NTBT*, 386.
132. Beale, *NTBT*, 907.
133. Beale, *NTBT*, 900f.
134. Beale, *NTBT*, 902.
135. Beale, *NTBT*, 402.

steps, obeys, and therefore succeeds in doing what Israel should have done.[136] The title "son of God" for Jesus therefore, "is a reference to Jesus being and doing what the first Adam and Israel should have been and should have done."[137] Jesus Christ's perfect imaging of God represents the first occurrence of thoroughgoing imaging of God by a human, and represents the revivification of the image of God.[138]

In the New Testament, Beale observes that the gospel writers present Jesus as a second Adam figure. Luke's genealogy links Jesus to "Adam, the son of God."[139] Mark's gospel opens with a reference to the first verse of Genesis,[140] and his immediate quotation of Isaiah "resonates with new-creational ideas."[141] Matthew's gospel culminates in Jesus giving the Great Commission, wherein Jesus speaks directly from the Adamic commissions given to the patriarchs.[142] The goal of Jesus's ministry after his ascension, as Matthew presents it, is to fill the entire earth with God-imaging humans.[143] In all these ways, Beale sees Jesus as fulfilling the Old Testament's understanding of "son of God."

b) Christ the king who images God

Beale also writes that, like the first Adam, Jesus was commissioned to be a king on earth in the image of God, and his presence functioned to forward the glory and reign of God on the earth.[144] As the image of God, Adam was a king of the earth and was to rule over the earth by mirroring the rule of God himself.[145] Beale holds the kingdom themes in the Synoptic gospels to be "an aspect of

---

136. Beale, *NTBT*, 392, 406.
137. Beale, *NTBT*, 403.
138. Beale, *NTBT*, 427-429.
139. Beale, *NTBT*, 391.
140. Beale, *NTBT*, 391.
141. Beale, *NTBT*, 392.
142. Beale, *NTBT*, 390.
143. Beale, *NTBT*, 390f.
144. Beale, *NTBT*, 427.
145. Beale, *NTBT*, 32.

Jesus,"[146] mirroring the reign of God as the eschatological Adamic viceregent. Christ's healings and miracles were signs of the inbreaking of this new creational kingdom, for they represent the reversal of the Genesis 3 curse which bound all within the first creation.[147] "Christ's healings [are] the beginning reversal of the physical effects of Adam's fall and a foreshadowing of full healing in Christ..."[148]

Thus, for Beale, one facet of Jesus being the paradigmatic viceregent is his kingship, which functionally images God on earth, and is therefore a re-exertion of God's dominion in the creation.

c) Christ the son of man

Beale holds that Jesus calling himself "the son of man" indicates that Christ thought of himself as the end-time Adam inaugurating the new creation.[149] Looking back to Daniel 7, Beale explains that "the passage portrays the Son of Man as heading up Israel's end-time kingdom and also depicts him as a latter-day Adam figure ('the Son of Adam') and as a king over all the beasts…of the earth."[150] Further, regarding Matthew 19:28, Beale holds that "the regeneration of the cosmos" when the Son of Man will sit on his glorious throne and judge, will be when Jesus "will inherit what the first Adam should have inherited."[151]

Perceiving Christ in this way is part of Beale's key idea that Jesus is the one true viceregent.

d) Christ as obedient in temptation

Beale also holds that Jesus is the paradigmatic viceregent because he obeyed in temptation where Adam and Israel sinned. Beale perceives Adamic themes at play in the gospels' temptation narratives. Luke's mention of Jesus's

---

146. Beale, *NTBT*, 427.
147. Beale, *NTBT*, 427.
148. Beale, *NTBT*, 906.
149. Beale, *NTBT*, 396, 404-405.
150. Beale, *NTBT*, 390.
151. Beale, *NTBT*, 391.

genealogical connection to "Adam, the son of God" immediately prior to the temptation narrative in chapter 4 invokes this contrast between the first Adam, who fell, and Jesus's resistance to Satan in the wilderness. Beale also notes that Mark 1:13, *he was with the wild beasts*, hearkens back to Eden where Adam was to reign over the animals,[152] and alludes to Isaianic passages which foresee the wild beasts honoring the Messiah (43:20), and living in harmony with humans (11:1-10). Just as Adam was to have subdued the snake in the garden, Jesus's perseverance through Satan's temptations was a notable defeat of Satan[153] – an act of Adamic subduing of the earth, for the beasts were once again subject to a human.

Beale identifies more in Christ's temptation narratives: what he refers to as Christ's personal conquest of eschatological Canaan.[154] Jesus, Beale says, was achieving obedience and victory where Israel failed.[155] Jesus's verbal responses to Satan revisit and reverse Israel's idolatrous failures.[156] In prevailing in the temptations rather than failing as Israel did in the wilderness, Jesus became equipped to "go in and possess the land promised" – ultimately to prevail over Satan in the cross and resurrection, which spiritually parallels Joshua's extermination of the Canaanites in the promised land.[157] For Beale, then, the gospels' exorcism narratives describe Jesus cleansing Israel from her idolatry, forwarding the holy warfare as spiritual Israel,[158] and this ministry was made possible by Christ's prior victory over Satan in the temptations.

In these ways, Christ's obedience in temptation is a facet of how Beale understands Jesus to be the paradigmatic viceregent.

---

152. Beale, *NTBT*, 418.
153. Beale, *NTBT*, 435.
154. Beale, *NTBT*, 419, 419fn83.
155. Beale, *NTBT*, 419.
156. Beale, *NTBT*, 417-418.
157. Beale, *NTBT*, 419.
158. Beale, *NTBT*, 420.

e) Christ the keeper and filler of creation

Beale notes that in Genesis 2, Adam is placed in the garden to keep and guard it. He writes, "Genesis 2:15 continues the theme of subduing and filling the earth by humanity…"[159] Beale sees this policing and judging facet of Adam's task as intended to expand to include the entire earth. As the bounds of the Eden-temple expanded to encompass the entire creation, the earth would require more humans to police and guard its holy precincts.[160] Per Beale, the manifestation of God's glory would also be compounded through Adam's obedience to the divine command to be fruitful, multiply, and fill the earth. By raising godly progeny, Adam and Eve would populate the earth with God-imaging glorifiers, accomplish their Genesis 2:15 "keep and guard" command, and thus fill creation with the glory of God.

Beale sees these themes from the Adamic viceregal commission present in the way Jesus foresees his disciple-progeny filling the earth as well. Just as Adam would have taught his descendants the words of God so that their filling of the earth would be according to the righteous expectations of the viceregal commission, Beale notes Jesus's command to make disciples of every nation, baptizing and teaching them to obey.[161] Noting Matthew 12:46-50, Beale writes that this progeny of Christ are not merely his blood-relatives; "the true people of God no longer can be marked out by certain nationalistic badges that distinguish one nation from another."[162] Acting like Jesus is the mark of a faithful new Israelite, for Jesus does what humanity (and Israel) was intended to do: to manifest God's reign on earth.[163]

---

159. Beale, *NTBT*, 32.
160. Beale, *NTBT*, 38.
161. Beale, *NTBT*, 423-427.
162. Beale, *NTBT*, 424.
163. Beale, *NTBT*, 425-427.

In this way, Beale sees Christ as the Adamic keeper and the filler of creation, and this informs his idea that Jesus is the one true viceregent with whom Christians identify.

The second key idea, then, within Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency is that Christians identify with Jesus Christ, the one true viceregent. The discussion suggested that Beale understands "identification" as meaning that Christians have faith in Jesus Christ and experience the benefits of his resurrection. It also noted five facets of Beale's idea that Jesus Christ is the one true viceregent: 1) Christ the Old Testament "son of God", 2) Christ the king who images God, 3) Christ the "son of man", 4) Christ as obedient in temptation, and 5) Christ the keeper and filler of creation. These facets interpenetrate throughout Beale's work, yet isolating them has helped clarify what exactly Beale's second key idea – that Jesus is the paradigmatic viceregent with whom Christians identify – means.

Analysis and Critique

Though Beale's identification of Jesus as the second Adam begins from clear Scriptural precedent, he develops this idea using a method somewhat unique to contemporary theology. He is explicit in acknowledging this, writing:

> [A]n examination of Jesus as the last Adam in the Synoptic Gospels is one way of obtaining conceptually the evangelists' picture of him as the flawless image of God on earth. This task…is easier in the case of Paul, since he uses explicit language of "Adam" and "image" of God in application to Christ and believers, which the Gospels do not use. Nevertheless, I believe that we can trace conceptually in Jesus's ministry the functional aspects of ruling, multiplying, and resting, which have their roots in the threefold functions that Adam was originally designed to carry out in reflection of God's same threefold activities in Gen. 1.[164]

Significant here is Beale's assertion that the Adamic characteristics of Jesus's rule can be obtained by examining the gospel accounts. Though the New Testament

164. Beale, *NTBT*, 386.

does offer what might be considered the seeds of such an analysis, Beale mentions "the explicit language of 'Adam' and 'image'" in Paul's writings," Beale offers no critical engagement regarding his decision to expand these seeds by reading the Synoptics in this way.[165] Beale seems to have anticipated his readers' questioning this. He writes:

> This may be one of the most controversial chapters in the book, since I am discussing a significant amount of Synoptic material under the conceptual category of Jesus restoring the functional image of God. This is an unusual move for a theology of the NT. However, recall that this book is not a "theology of the New Testament" but rather a "biblical theology of the New Testament."[166]

Though Beale acknowledges the uniqueness of his method here, he does not defend it by critically engaging his choice for reading the Synoptics, but rather by referring back to his choice of method. But this skirts the question. Though Beale's subsequent engagement with individual gospel texts seems clearly to show a growing body of critical work supportive of viewing instances in Jesus's life as Adamic,[167] his broader claim – that the Synoptic gospels portray, and can therefore be read to perceive, Christ as "the flawless image of God on earth" – lacks critical engagement and support. As in his other chapters, Beale's subsequent discussion stockpiles exegetical information in favor of his initially-stated thesis,[168] yet this accrual may not convince all readers.

Using the person and work of Jesus to reflect on the concept of the image of God has historical precedent in the Christian theological tradition,[169] though, as noted, the extent and method of Beale's reflection seems unique among biblical theologians. N.T. Wright's work intersects similar concepts in discussions of

---

165. E.g. the absence of critical engagement with other sources in Beale, *NTBT*, 382-388. Beale notes his argument's reliance upon Warren Gage (383fn3) and Seyoon Kim (384fn6), but appears to receive them without question.

166. Beale, *NTBT*, 386.

167. Beale, *NTBT*, 388-437.

168. Beale, *NTBT*, 388-437.

169. Athanasius, *On the Incarnation* (Yonkers, New York: St. Vladmir's Seminary Press, 2011) chapters 7-10.

what Wright terms "Adam-christology."[170] Systematic theologians from the Dutch Calvinist tradition seem to have begun to discuss Jesus as the perfect example of the image of God in the twentieth century;[171] their influence seems clearly evident in the works of Dan McCartney[172] and Paul Schrotenboer.[173] However, this pattern of reflection is not uniform among all Dutch Calvinists; many do not mention Christ's actions in the gospels in relation to Genesis 1:26-28.[174]

Yet another question might be asked here of Beale's interpretation. Is Beale, as he claims, reading the Synoptics with a static understanding of Adam in mind, or has he already used the New Testament to interpret Adam's role in Eden, such that his reading of the Synoptics is just the next step in a dialogue between the Old and the New Testament? A critical reader finds parts of Beale's understanding of Adam which do not emanate from a simple reading of Genesis 1-3; for example, the idea that Adam was to expand Eden to fill the entire earth.[175] On this point at least, it seems that Beale is engaging in what Chapter 3 of this thesis proposed: a Childsian, Christocentric rereading which revisits and groups texts, in this case Genesis 1-3, in light of the New Testament's witness to Jesus. This reflects holding the two testaments in a dialogic relationship, another characteristic of Brevard Childs's process for biblical theology.

---

170. N.T. Wright, *Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 1993) 307.

171. "The Incarnation confirms the doctrine of the image of God." Anthony A. Hoekema, *Created in God's Image*, 22, cf. also 73-75, esp.75fn21. Hendrikus Berkof begins his book on theological anthropology with the section titled "Jesus Christ, the True Man." *Man in Transit*, trans. Richard Wolff (Wheaton, Illinois: Key, 1971) 15; see also G.C. Berkouwer's discussion in *Man: the Image of God*, esp. 84-100.

172. Dan G. McCartney, "Ecce Homo: The Coming of the Kingdom as the Restoration of Human Vicegerency," *Westminster Theological Journal* 56:1 (Spring 1994): 1-21.

173. Paul G. Schrotenboer, *Man in God's World: The Biblical Idea of Office* (Pittsburgh: Radix, 1989), originally published in the October 1967 issue of International Reformed Bulletin (Grand Rapids).

174. E.g. Louis Berkhof, *Systematic Theology*, 202-210, 312-320.

175. Beale, *NTBT*, 35f, 614-648. Beale may have garnered the basic insight of Eden's expansion from Meredith Kline, *Kingdom Prologue: Genesis Foundations for a Covenantal Worldview* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2006) 86f. Beale cites Kline on this point in *TBR*, 1111fn205.

If this is true, then it may not be the case that Beale is simply reading the Synoptics in light of Pauline language, but that Beale has already read Genesis 1-3 in light of the entire New Testament, and is now revisiting the New Testament in light of Genesis 1-3. This suggestion seems to be supported by Beale's following of Warren Gage's *The Gospel of Genesis*, which reads Genesis in parallel with New Testament passages,[176] as well as Beale's comment earlier in *A New Testament Biblical Theology* that Scriptural passages written later "unpack the meaning of that earlier Scripture."[177] Beale's discussion of Christ as the Adamic image of God, then, may be another example of how his project shares characteristics of a Childsian Christocentric rereading of the canon. Such a project would sponsor reading multiple passages of Scripture in conversation with one another, and thus give more warrant to Beale's method of reading the Synoptic gospels, as "one way of obtaining conceptually…him as the flawless image of God on earth."[178]

Beale's description of the content of this key idea is extensive and persuasive. As noted above, Beale's discussion of specific gospel texts demonstrate the existence of a body of critical work supportive of viewing instances in Jesus's life as Adamic,[179] though Beale's project draws this body together in an unprecedented manner. None of the five facets of Beale's idea that Jesus is the one true viceregent, nor the idea that Christians identify with Jesus, represent great innovations in the history of Christian theological reflection. Yet Beale's project exhibits critical power in the way he unifies and develops these ideas. Akin to blazing a new trail to an already-established campsite, Beale shows that a biblical-theological method can arrive at the same ideological locales visited by, for example, the Dutch Calvinist systematic theological reflection noted

176. Warren A. Gage, *The Gospel of Genesis* (Winona Lake, Indiana: Carpenter Books, 1984) 4f, esp. 5fn7.

177. Beale, *NTBT*, 3.

178. Beale, *NTBT*, 386.

179. Beale, *NTBT*, 388-437.

earlier in this chapter. Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency is distinct in this way.

But how does this key idea from Beale inform the viceregal homiletic? What does a Christian identifying with Jesus Christ the one true viceregent have to do with preaching? The following discussion will present another of the viceregal homiletic's summative statements about preaching.

Summative Statements About Preaching

Holding that Christians identify with Jesus the one true viceregent produces implications regarding the person of the preacher in relation to the Christian God, and therefore the specific nature of the preacher's authority.

Per the viceregal homiletic, a preacher is functioning viceregally, that is, according to the pattern of his redeemed identity in the image of God, and therefore he speaks to creation from God. He does this from his redeemed identity and position within Jesus, the viceregent of God. The Christian preacher speaks as Jesus does: to creation on behalf of God. Holding Christ to be the one true viceregent of God implies that preaching today is part of Christ's viceregal rule of the earth. Preaching today serves alongside the teaching, miracles, healings, exorcisms, death, and resurrection of Jesus to expand the presence of God's kingdom in creation. Briefly stated, it infers that *the preacher partakes of Christ's viceregency.*

The idea that Jesus is the paradigmatic viceregent implies that the shape and character of Christ's ministry demonstrates the character of the authority of preaching. This implication develops the two summative statements, stated above, into a discrete third. If the preacher speaks alongside Jesus and partakes of the viceregency of Jesus, then the preacher's authority is not a nonspecific divine authority, but the specific viceregal authority which Jesus Christ exerts for the completion of the Adamic commission. The preacher speaks with Jesus Christ's Adamic authority over creation. This authority does not proceed from the preacher's own person, but from the person of Jesus. Further, this authority is

itself integrated into the fabric and order of creation; it is not alien or otherworldly, but is a result of the redemption of God reanimating and redeeming the structures of creation which were originally intended by God.

Thus, so far this chapter has discussed two of four key ideas from Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency, and has noted three summative statements those ideas imply about preaching.

1. Preaching images God; it is a sign of his rule and presence on earth.
2. Preaching is a human act which expands the reign of God.
3. Preachers participate in Christ's viceregency.

Our discussion of Beale's unique understanding of Christian viceregency will now move onto a third key idea of Beale's Christian viceregency.

Key Idea Three: The Expanding Intent of Adam's Mission

Beale argues that Adam's obedience to the Adamic commission would eventually subdue the entire creation and fill it with the glory of God.[180] Beale asserts that the statement in Genesis 2:15 that God put the man in Eden to "work it and take care of it" indicates that Eden was the starting point and the template from which Adam was to develop the rest of creation: "Adam, as God's vice-regent, and his progeny were to put 'the finishing touches' on the world God created in Genesis 1 by making it a livable place for humans."[181] This development of creation would involve Adam's obedience to Genesis 1:26-28, specifically the commands to be fruitful, multiply, and fill the earth, in addition to teaching his children the commands God had given.[182]

The idea that the Adamic commission intends to expand the markers of God's reign is, for Beale, rooted in understanding Eden as a temple. Beale notes that the verbs translated "cultivate/serve and guard" in Genesis 2:15 are used later

180. Beale, *TCM*, 81.

181. Beale, *TCM*, 82.

182. Beale, *NTBT*, 423, *TCM*, 82. "God…formed [the earth] to be inhabited."

in the Pentateuch to describe the cultic function of temple priests.[183] Based on this intertextuality as well as other Scriptural allusions, Beale posits that Eden was a temple, and Adam was its priest.[184] Because God commands Adam to multiply and fill the earth, Beale concludes that Eden would eventually encompass the entire earth.[185] As Adam expanded the bounds of Eden and functioned as its priestly king, the earth would progressively fill with the glory of God.[186] Thus, Beale sees Adam's commission as intending to expand Eden, God's temple, to encompass all of creation.[187]

Like his understanding of the interconnection of Adam's identity and mission, Beale finds evidence throughout the canon that the Adamic commission intended to expand God's presence, of which Eden was a physical marker. For example, Beale reads Genesis 3 as Adam's failure to guard Eden, and therefore a failure of duty to keep and expand God's presence.[188] Likewise, the remainder of the Old Testament, while noting small examples of success, attests to Israel's overall failure in this viceregal expansion of God's presence, for Israel neither purged the promised land of Canaanites nor remained pure in its own worship of God.[189]

In the New Testament, however, "…the mission of Adam and Israel to expand the temple of God's presence is taken up by Christ and the church. They finally accomplish the task left undone by both Adam and Israel."[190] Beale sees this exhibited in Christ's ministry and in the Church's spreading of the gospel.[191] He writes that just as Adam would have taught his children the words of God in

---

183. Beale, *TCM*, 66-70, 81f.
184. Beale, *TCM*, 81-99.
185. Beale, *TCM*, 81-87.
186. Beale, *NTBT*, 38.
187. Beale, *NTBT*, 614-650. Summarized on 912f.
188. Beale, *NTBT*, 33.
189. Beale, *NTBT*, 33.
190. Beale, *NTBT*, 913.
191. Beale, *NTBT*, 423.

order to fill the earth with God-reflecting offspring, Jesus taught his disciples and then commanded them to make disciples of every nation, baptizing and teaching them to obey his commands.[192] The presentation of the New Jerusalem in Revelation 21:1-22:5 as a garden-city confirms that the Adamic mission of expanding Eden to encompass the entire creation will succeed.[193]

Thus, for Beale, the Great Commission is a renewal of the Adamic commission of Genesis 1:26-28.[194] Both intend expansion of God's glory throughout the earth. Jesus's progeny, however, expand through evangelization and discipleship rather than begetting children or conquering pagan nations. The progeny of Christ are not merely his blood-relatives.[195] The new humanity, the progeny of Jesus, is made up of those who do the will of the Father. As the Church successfully evangelizes the nations, then, it expands the Edenic kingdom of God by populating it with the new humanity "born" of Jesus, similar to how Adam was to expand in and from Eden.

Analysis and Critique

This key idea in Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency is an ongoing motif of Beale's *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, and is more directly developed in Beale's other 2004 book, *The Temple and the Church's Mission*.[196] The key idea here – that Adam's mission intended to expand the kingdom presence of God – rests upon Beale's assertion that the concept of the tabernacle and temple provides "the rubric, running throughout redemptive-history, under which God's

---

192. Beale also notes that Matthew's account of the great commission echoes Daniel 7, where the "one like a son of man" is given authority, glory and sovereign power, a seemingly clear echo of humankind's viceregal reinvestiture. Beale, *NTBT*, 423.

193. Beale, *TBR*, 1109-1111. Also *TCM*, 23-26.

194. Beale, *NTBT*, 57. Also *TCM*, 117-121.

195. Beale, *NTBT*, 424.

196. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A biblical theology of the dwelling place of God* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity, 2004). Similar to critical reception of *A New Testament Biblical Theology*, reviewers of *The Temple and the Church's Mission* expressed general agreement with Beale's central thrust, though noted that his discussion sometimes related Scriptures in ways less than persuasive. David G. Firth, review of *The Temple and the Church's Mission* by Gregory K. Beale, *European Journal of Theology* 18.2 (2009): 195f.

intentions for humanity are framed."[197] Beale is not the first to use the motif of God's temple-presence in this way. Scholars including Jon Levenson[198] and Meredith Kline[199] – Beale cites both[200] – and Samuel Terrien,[201] whose work on temple-presence Beale does not mention, identify and develop the temple theme in similar ways.[202]

What makes Beale unique among these scholars, however, is his development of the temple expansion theme into an explanation of Christian ministry and mission today.[203] The "controlling paradigm" for Beale in this is "Genesis 1:28 in relation to the Garden of Eden in Genesis 2."[204] In other words, Beale sees Eden as the place where Adam's Genesis 1:28 mission would be fulfilled, and thus reflects on all of Scripture through the rubric of Adam's Edenic work to expand God's glory. The result of this is that Beale considers the contemporary Church's ministries with Genesis 1:28 in mind.

Beneath this biblical-theological pattern, however, seems to lurk an important question: what exactly does Beale mean when he writes, or at least implies strongly, that Christians exert viceregal authority today? If Beale's understanding is that Christians expand the Edenic reign of God with a sheer divine power, this would seem to animate unsavory examples of the Church exerting power in society. Does Beale's understanding of Edenic expansion include Christian viceregents expressing dominion directly over society, even

---

197. Harold E. Dollar, review of *The Temple and the Church's Mission* by Gregory K. Beale, *Missiology*, 34.1 (January 2006): 81f.

198. Jon D. Levenson, *Sinai and Zion* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985).

199. Beale may have garnered the basic insight of Eden's expansion from Meredith Kline, *Kingdom Prologue: Genesis Foundations for a Covenantal Worldview* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2006) 86f. Beale cites Kline on this point in *TBR*, 1111fn205.

200. Beale, *TCM*, 415, 427.

201. Samuel L. Terrien, *The Elusive Presence: Toward a New Biblical Theology* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978).

202. David Renwick, review of *The Temple and the Church's Mission* by Gregory K. Beale, *Lexington Theological Quarterly*, 42.1 (Spring 2007): 70-72.

203. E.g. Beale, *TCM*, 395-402.

204. Beale, *TCM*, 385.

politics? If not, how does it differ from other visions of Christian authority which do include such dominion?

The basic idea that Christ exerts his dominion through Christians has a long history. As early as the fifth century, Byzantine emperors were titled "viceregents of Christ."[205] European coronation liturgies of the last 1200 years have, in ways implicit and explicit, ascribed viceregal authority to the monarch.[206] During the Reformation, John Calvin's work regularly implied that Christians exerted God's authority on earth,[207] though to date no work has presented a synthetic proposal of Calvin's view of viceregency.[208] Within Dutch Calvinist theological reflection in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, Abraham Kuyper's[209] and Herman Dooyeweerd's[210] and, more recently, Cornelius Van Til's work[211] proceed under a similar general, yet muted, assumption that humans' dominion over the earth has been restored in Jesus Christ.

Even this relatively small group of examples represents multiple understandings of what dominion is and how Christians gain it. On the one hand, the European coronation traditionsgenerally held that kings and queens specifically reign in God's name.[212] Thus, one gains dominion when he or she is

---

205. Cf. F.E. Brightman, "Byzantine Imperial Coronations," *Journal of Theological Studies*, 2 (1901): 380, 388, 390. This concept is also evident in the styles which preceded the names of Carolingian rulers of the Holy Roman Empire which, beginning in 801, include "serenissimus Augustus a Deo coronatus" – "most serene Augustus, crowned by God." Cf. *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Diplomata Karolinorum I, 77f.

206. Roy Strong, *Coronation: From the 8th to the 21st Century* (London: Harper Perennial, 2005) 3-17.

207. Cf. Ronald S. Wallace, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament* (Tyler, Texas: Geneva Divinity School, 1982) 82-95.

208. Personal correspondence by email with Dan G. McCartney, March 6th, 2014.

209. Abraham Kuyper, *Lectures on Calvinism: Six Lectures Delivered at Princeton University Under Auspices of the L.P. Stone Foundation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994).

210. Herman Dooyeweerd, *A New Critique of Theoretical Thought*, in *Collected Works of Herman Dooyeweerd*, ed. D.F.M. Strauss. Series A. 1-4 (Lewiston, New York: E. Mellen Press, 1997).

211. Cornelius Van Til, *The Defense of the Faith* (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian & Reformed, 2008) 72f.

212. Cf. the oath taken by the regent at the beginning of English coronations, which presents the regent as God's servant to preserve the Church of God in peace and, since the

anointed or crowned in the name of Jesus Christ to rule.[213] On the other hand, Dutch neo-Calvinism engenders a wider cultural project which involves all Christian believers in all areas of society.[214] Under this understanding, one gains dominion by faithfully pursuing God's priorities in whatever sphere of creation one is called into, particularly in one's family and employment.

The work of Rousas Rushdoony, an ideological father of what became known in the United States as Christian reconstructionism or theonomy,[215] focused and developed the Dutch Calvinist understanding of dominion. Moving beyond what the Dutch Calvinists had implied, Rushdoony claimed explicitly that Christians had an obligation to transform societal institutions because of their divinely authorized Adamic authority over creation.[216] Jesus Christ had "instituted the new creation" wherein "man in the covenant is restored to the task given to man originally, to exercise dominion and to subdue the earth."[217]

Reformation, has included a pledge "to maintain the Laws of God and the true profession of the Gospel." Roy Strong, *Coronation: From the 8th to the 21st Century*, 4, 487.

213. In the history of the English coronations, this concept exists alongside discussions of the regent's power of the keys. Cf. Roy Strong, *Coronation: From the 8th to the 21st Century*, 234-243. The concept is also portrayed in artistic representations of European coronations; e.g., the 12th century mosaic of Roger II of Sicily being crowned by Jesus in the Concattedrale Santa Maria dell'Ammiraglio, Sicily.

214. Abraham Kuyper, *Lectures on Calvinism*; Cornelius Van Til, *The Defense of the Faith*; Brian J. Walsh and J. Richard Middleton, *The Transforming Vision Shaping a Christian World View* (Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity, 1984); Bradshaw Frey, *All of Life Redeemed: Biblical Insights for Daily Obedience* (Jordan Station, Ontario: Paideia, 1983); Albert M. Wolters, *Creation Regained: A Transforming View of the World* (Leicester: Intervarsity, 1986).

215. Rousas J. Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, volumes 1-3 (Nutley, New Jersey: Craig Press, 1973). Michael J. McVicar, *Christian Reconstruction: R. J. Rushdoony and American Religious Conservatism* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina, 2015) 210f and 213-215, notes the Dutch Calvinist influence upon Rushdoony. Other theonomist writers who closely followed and expanded Rushdoony's work include Gary North, *Unconditional Surrender: God's Program for Victory* (Tyler, Texas: Institute for Christian Economics, 1983); and Greg L. Bahnsen, *Theonomy in Christian Ethics* (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1984). These writers exerted significant influence within social and political discussions in the United States during the 1980s and 1990s.

216. Cf. Michael McVicar, *Christian Reconstruction*, 131-134.

217. Rousas J. Rushdoony, "Dominion Man," audio recording transcript, accessed August 16, 2018, http://www.pocketcollege.com/transcripts/014%20-%20Contemporary%20Cultural%20Ethics%20(15%20was%20a%20duplicate%20of%20this)/RR132D7.html.

Initially, then, Rushdoony's understanding of Christian authority may seem similar to Beale's. Yet further investigation reveals significant differences in the language Rushdoony uses to describe what dominion is and how Christians are to gain it. Pursuing Rushdoony on this point will continue to clarify how Beale's understanding of viceregency is unique, and will give further light to the question of how the viceregal homiletic is new and distinct.

Per Rushdoony, the "dominion mandate" of Genesis 1:28 requires humans to "subdue all things and all nations to Christ and His law-word."[218] "Law is," wrote Rushdoony, "inescapably a plan of conquest, and we fail to understand the significance of law if we do not see it as the means whereby the righteousness of God is to prevail…"[219] Specifically, Christian men and families are central to God's plan. For Rushdoony, the family, headed by the redeemed man, was the central organ for the conquest of earth's cultures and societies by God's kingdom. Christians, particularly men, wrote Rushdoony, were to forward God's kingdom on earth by ordering their inner selves and families by God's law.[220] Flowing from this internal and familial ordering, the "dominion man" would inevitably overtake and reconstruct all of life on earth "in Christ's image."[221]

As one critic wrote, for Rushdoony, "The determining proposition is that the Mosaic law given at Sinai was not just for Israel but is God's design for all nations of all times."[222] The Bible was God's blueprint, God's law, for ordering all of society.[223] Enacting a society that reflected Scripture was therefore the duty of Christians, for they were kings. Rushdoony claims, "a king must exercise

---

218. Rousas J. Rushdoony, *Institutes of Biblical Law*, vol 1, 14.

219. Rousas J. Rushdoony, "Dominion Man."

220. Rousas J. Rushdoony, "Dominion Man."

221. Rousas J. Rushdoony, "Dominion Man," in Michael J. McVicar, *Christian Reconstruction*, 132.

222. Richard J. Neuhaus, "Why Wait for the Kingdom?: The Theonomist Temptation," *First Things* (May 1990).

223. Richard J. Neuhaus, "Why Wait for the Kingdom?"

dominion or he is no king…No other idea is tenable in Scripture other than that a king is one who exercises dominion."[224]

Rushdoony's vision of contemporary Christian viceregency, or dominion, is inextricably linked to its practical outworking in society. In other words, a theonomic understanding of Christian viceregency demands societal and political dominance on the part of its adherents. This engagement is usually envisioned as combative and oppositional, for it is the furtherance and defense, to use Rushdoony's terminology, of "God's law." For Rushdoony, a society's actions determine whether the society is good or bad; through enacting Christian laws, moral actions will supplant and conquer evil. Rushdoony wrote, "Every law-order is a state of war against the enemies of that order, *and all law is a form of warfare*."[225] "The theonomists insist that the kingdom is now, if only the true believers have the boldness to take dominion."[226] Such actions, in the extreme, might include taking the lives of blasphemers.[227] Rushdoony's theonomic vision seeks to push against the order of the fallen world with the "dominion" of Christ restored to Christians. For Rushdoony, dominion today is war, and Christian viceregents are warriors[228] given license by Genesis 1:26-28 to war for Christ's kingdom.

Critics have rightly objected to Rushdoony's understanding on these points. But how does this theonomist vision differ from the concept of Christian

---

224. Rousas J. Rushdoony, "Dominion Man."

225. Rousas J. Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, vol. 1, 93 (italics in original), in Michael J. McVicar, *Christian Reconstruction*, 106.

226. Richard J. Neuhaus, "Why Wait for the Kingdom?"

227. Rousas J. Rushdoony, *The Institutes of Biblical Law*, vol. 1, 38.

228. Michael McVicar's 2015 book, *Christian Reconstruction: R.J. Rushdoony and American Religious Conservatism*, contextualizes theonomy's assertions of the contemporary relevance of God's law, particularly the publication of Rushdoony's three-volume *The Institutes of Biblical Law* in 1973, within the societal unrest of the late 1960s. McVicar writes, "In the lived experience of so many Americans, the sixties were a decade of delinquency, crime, and the fraying of a once tightly woven social fabric." As a response to this, conservative Protestant churches favored, rather than social or political activism, a reassertion of "law and order." Though McVicar does not explicitly state it, Rushdoony's assertion of biblical law's importance fits notably well with the societal instability of the 1960s. Michael J. McVicar, *Christian Reconstruction*, 107-109.

viceregency forwarded by Beale? Our brief discussion here will note two areas of difference.

First, Rushdoony's vision seems wedded to an inherent verticality[229] not only between redeemed humanity and unredeemed society or culture, but also between men and their families, and between husband and wife. Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency does not depend on such verticality.

Pertinent at this point is an insight from Richard Bauckham. Bauckham has traced the history of exegesis of Genesis 1:26-28, and finds that modern biblical exegesis has interpreted Adam's dominion of Genesis 1 in ways that emphasize Adam's domination over creation rather than Adam's kinship with creation. He comments on the meaning of the term "stewardship":

> The problem is in part that stewardship remains, like most interpretations of the Genesis "dominion"...an image that depicts the human relationship to the rest of creation in an entirely "vertical" way. It sets humans above the rest of creation, sharply differentiated from it, in God-given charge of it. As far as the resources of Christian history goes, it needs at least to be supplemented by the medieval Christian awareness...of mutuality, interdependence, friendliness, and confraternity between human beings and the other creatures of God.[230]

Bauckham notes that defining "dominion" in exclusively a vertical manner downplays the concomitant theme of Genesis 1-3, that is, that humans are a part of the creation under God. He then invites Christians to acknowledge their creatureliness alongside the rest of creation.

The remainder of Bauckham's essay demonstrates that such a horizontal perception of "dominion" does have precedent in the Christian Church. This kind of theocentric vision of the creation, says Bauckham, "imposes ethical limits on human dominion over it... Human beings have been entrusted by God with

---

229. I adopt the concept of verticality from Richard Bauckham, "Dominion Interpreted – a Historical Account," in *Living With Other Creatures* (Waco, Texas: Baylor University, 2011) 62.

230. Richard Bauckham, *Living with Other Creatures* , 62.

the care of creatures not existing for human benefit. This is not just a restraint on dominion but a different idea of dominion."[231]

Bauckham's insight here, that a theocentric understanding of creation does not merely restrain dominion, but produces "a different idea of dominion," raises a salient question for a reader of Rushdoony: has Rushdoony's entire project misunderstood dominion in a theocentric creation? One clearly observes a thoroughgoing verticality in Rushdoony's vision of Christian dominion, and it would be understandable for a reader, at points, simply to say that Rushdoony's "dominion" goes too far. Yet Bauckham's insight steers the discussion in a different direction, towards a different idea of what dominion is. Bauckham suggests that this different idea must include a horizontalizing of the concept of dominion such that it is redefined altogether.

Beale's concept of Christian viceregency seems more congruent with this kind of a horizontalization. While clearly including an aspect of expansion,[232] Beale's viceregency lacks the inherent verticality as well as the aggressive stance observable in Rushdoony. Beale does not use the phrase, "taking dominion;" instead, the viceregal power possessed by the Church is that which is shared with the exalted viceregent, Jesus Christ. Through their redemption, Christians are enabled to obey God's commands, becoming functional images once again.[233] They expand the kingdom by worshipping, praying, evangelizing, studying Scripture, and remaining faithful in temptation as they look forward to Christ's return.[234] Further, Christ's viceregal rule is seen in the Church's discipline of its members and in the activity of the spiritual gifts, both of which result in evangelization and obedience of the world.[235] Rather than stating that the Church explicitly exerts power or dominion over the nations, Beale often

---

231. Richard Bauckham, *Living with Other Creatures*, 58, italics added.

232. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 912f.

233. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 962.

234. E.g. Beale, *TCM*, 395-402.

235. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 909, 913, 929.

expresses the victory of the Church coming through the death and resurrection of Jesus.[236] Contemporary Christians reign with Christ as they faithfully witness to Christ and endure opposition and persecution at the hands of the nations.[237] Publicly, this is not an aggressive, warlike rule, but an ironic rule that can manifest in the humiliation and seeming failure of its adherents.[238] It nevertheless triumphs over all things.

Yet here the second area of difference between Beale and Rushdoony emerges. It is necessary to assert, with others,[239] that Rushdoony's theonomy seems less than adequate to integrate the ironic nature of Christ's victory over sin and death on the cross. If no servant is greater than his master, and if Jesus triumphed through submitting himself to the crucifixion, then it seems that Christians today cannot expect societal domination, whatever form that domination might be expected to take.

Beale's understanding of the nature of Christ's victory implies that Christian dominion today is not a warlike, triumphing project, but one which follows after the ironic victory of the crucifixion. Beale's concept of Christian viceregency locates contemporary viceregal authority in Christ himself, who paradigmatically exerted his power through his obedience to death on the cross and his resurrection from the dead. Concomitantly, the Church's restored viceregal authority, in the words of Beale, "consists in conquering by not compromising their faithful witness in face of trials, spiritually ruling over the powers of evil that physically oppress them, as well as beginning to rule over death and Satan through their identification with Jesus."[240]

---

236. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 893f.

237. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 207f.

238. E.g. Beale, *TBR*, 996-1002.

239. E.g. William S. Barker and W. Robert Godfrey, eds., *Theonomy: A Reformed Critique* (Grand Rapids: Academie Books, 1990) 397f.

240. Beale, *NTBT*, 208.

Though Beale does not mention or cite Rushdoony in his work,[241] this Christ-centered, nonaggressive aspect of Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency seems congruent with a particular stream of Reformed theological reflection written in response to Rushdoony's theonomy.

A key response to theonomy was published in 1990: *Theonomy: A Reformed Critique*.[242] This volume is a collection of articles by faculty members of Westminster Theological Seminary, and addresses key areas where the faculty of Westminster claimed Rushdoony and the theonomists had departed from the Reformed theological tradition. Though covering a wide range of exegetical, theological, and historical issues, this collection of articles sparked a slight but notable evolution in the North American Reformed theological discussion's articulation of Christian viceregency. Reformed scholars, in part responding to theonomy's claims, developed accounts of Genesis 1:26-28 read with Christ's New Testament conduct in mind. Concomitantly, theonomy's theocratic vision of civil government was challenged by an understanding of Genesis 1:26-28 which emphasized the Church's role of stewarding all aspects of creation.

This slight shift can be seen in Reformed publications since 1990 which deal, at least indirectly, with the concept of Christian viceregency. For example, Michael Horton has inferred that theonomy's theocratic vision of civil government is untenable based on the inherent sinfulness of humans, even Christians.[243] Meredith Kline's biblical theology, when read in light of Rushdoony, seems clearly to repudiate the theonomic vision of Christian viceregency.[244] Paul G. Schrotenboer's *Man in God's World: The Biblical Idea of*

---

241. Beale does mention theonomy's view of OT law, however, noting his disagreement. Beale, *NTBT*, 872.

242. William S. Barker and W. Robert Godfrey, *Theonomy: A Reformed Critique*, 397f.

243. Michael Horton, "In God's Name: Guidelines for Proper Political Involvement." *Modern Reformation Magazine* (Sept. / Oct. Issue, Vol. 3.5, 1994).

244. Meredith G. Kline, *Kingdom Prologue: Genesis Foundations for a Covenantal Worldview* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2006).

Office was reprinted by Radix books in 1989, part of a promulgation of more traditional neo-Calvinist understandings of Christians and society.[245]

Furthermore, Dan McCartney became what seems to be the first Reformed scholar to connect, in publication, the coming of the kingdom of God in Jesus Christ to the restoration of the Church's Adamic viceregency over the earth.[246] In doing this, McCartney also appropriated insights from George Ladd's inaugurated eschatological understanding of the kingdom of God in the New Testament.[247] Like Beale's work, McCartney's vision of Christian dominion proceeds ideologically from understanding the viceregency of Christ himself, rather than upon simply contemporizing the Adamic commission in Genesis 1:26-28 by applying it directly to contemporary believers, as in Rushdoony. Additionally, McCartney helpfully clarifies that the presence of Christ's viceregal influence, like the presence of the kingdom of God in the Synoptic gospels, manifests in an inaugurated eschatological manner in the Church today. In McCartney, as later in Beale, Christians' authority over creation is not "fully realized" until the Last Day, when Christ himself will return.[248]

Recent publications outside the Reformed theological discussion have also touched upon Christian viceregency. N.T. Wright's work intersects similar concepts in discussions of what Wright terms "Adam-christology."[249] Roy Ciampa has identified viceregency as a theme within theologies of the New Testament.[250] Jason Hood's 2013 monograph *Imitating God in Christ: Recapturing*

---

245. "Publisher's Preface," in Paul G. Schrotenboer, *Man in God's World: The Biblical Idea of Office*, 3.

246. Dan G. McCartney, "Ecce Homo: The Coming of the Kingdom as the Restoration of Human Vicegerency," *Westminster Theological Journal* 56:1 (Spring, 1994): 1-21.

247. George E. Ladd, *A Theology of the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974).

248. Dan G. McCartney, "Ecce Homo: The Coming of the Kingdom as the Restoration of Human Vicegerency," 21.

249. N.T. Wright, *Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress Press, 1993) 307.

250. Notably Roy Ciampa, "The History of Redemption," in *Central Themes in Biblical Theology: Mapping Unity in Diversity*, Scott Hafemann and Paul R. House, eds. (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007). Ciampa uses both "viceregency" and "vicegerency."

a Biblical Pattern[251] introduces imitation as a central theme of Pauline ethics, and draws upon some existing literature on Christian viceregency, particularly that of McCartney.[252] Brian Payne's 2008 dissertation aimed to expand McCartney's concept of restored viceregency into ecclesiology,[253] though ultimately seems to fall back into a stance towards society similar to theonomy.

It seems clear that these are the ideological precursors of Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency. The fact that these precursors arose within the theological responses to theonomy corresponds with the fact that Beale's view of Christian viceregency sharply differs from Rushdoony's.

Thus, though both centralize God's words in Genesis 1:26-28, the understandings of Rushdoony and Beale differ greatly concerning what Christian viceregency is and how it is to be exerted today. Our discussion has traced this difference by noting how each understanding of viceregency incorporates verticality as well as the ironic nature of Christ's victory. On the way, our discussion noted that Beale's understanding of the expanding nature of the Adamic commission developed existing Dutch Calvinist reflection on viceregency. Beale's position, then, can be understood as a rejection of the theonomist vision.

Summative Statements About Preaching

But how does this key idea inform the viceregal homiletic's summative statements about preaching?

---

251. Jason Hood, *Imitating God in Christ: Recapturing a Biblical Pattern* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 2013). Hood uses "imitation," but also "co-creators" and "sub-creators." E.g. Jason Hood, *Imitating God in Christ*, 29.

252. Dan G. McCartney, "Ecce Homo: The Coming of the Kingdom as the Restoration of Human Vicegerency."

253. Brian K. Payne, "The Summing Up of all Things in Christ and the Restoration of Human Viceregency: Implications for Ecclesiology" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2008). Payne's study misquotes McCartney's title – mistaking McCartney's "vicegerency" for "viceregency."

First, this key idea funds the viceregal homiletic's statement that *preaching expands the reign of God.* Because preaching is an act obedient to God, preachers expand the kingdom of God just by preaching. This expansion is, at the very least, evident within the preacher; preparation and engagement with Scripture has manifested the kingdom of God in the preacher's own life. Further, preaching extends the kingdom of God in the sense that the preacher speaks words from God and about God in and to creation; the words of the sermon were not part of creation before the preacher spoke them. The expansion of the kingdom is evident as hearers of preaching grasp Scripture anew or, more significantly, repent and confess faith in Christ. The expansion is also evidenced when the sermon orders and explains the local church's ministries in light of Scripture, when preaching warns against false teaching, and when preaching exposes and condemns sin.

Yet the shape of Beale's understanding of Christian dominion grants a significant insight into the nature of the authority of Christian preaching. Christ's viceregal authority, and therefore the authority of preaching, *is not dominating.* The authority which Christ shares with the Church, and therefore with preachers, is not authority over other persons in order to subjugate them. Rather, it is authority to expand the reign of God in Christ on earth by faithfully giving testimony to the words and works of God. This authority does not subjugate hearers to the preacher, but hearers to Christ, and therefore to God. Preachers therefore, like Christ in his earthly ministry, speak with authority, yet this authority is not a sheer, unfiltered power that diminishes other human persons and exalts the preacher. Neither is the preacher's authority a guarantee that the rulers or government of any particular land will heed God's words.

The preacher exercises the rule of Christ inasmuch as the sermon witnesses to Jesus in truth. The preacher, then, does not speak with Christ's authority when, preaching, he or she speaks words contrary to the words of God in Scripture.

Thus, this chapter has discussed three of four key ideas from Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency, and has presented four summative statements on preaching.

1. Preaching images God; it is a sign of his rule and presence on earth.
2. Preaching is a human act which expands the reign of God.
3. Preachers participate in Christ's viceregency.
4. The authority of preaching is not dominating.

We now move onto a fourth key idea of Beale's Christian viceregency, the idea that Adam's mission was eschatological in nature.

Key Idea Four: The Eschatological Nature of Adam's Mission

Beale's *A New Testament Biblical Theology* integrates comprehensively the concept of inaugurated eschatology.[254] As Beale describes his biblical-theological method, he argues that the apostles thought of eschatology not as a mere discussion of the future, but "as a mind-set for understanding the present within the climaxing context of redemptive history."[255] In other words, the apostles interpreted their contemporary experiences in light of what God had done and was doing through Jesus Christ. The eschaton had begun with the death and resurrection of Christ. Because of this, believers were experiencing real benefits of Christ's inaugurated reign, yet also looked forward to receiving those benefits fully at his parousia.

Beale's project is, in part, an experiment in considering the contemporary world through the same inaugurated eschatology matrix.[256] *A New Testament Biblical Theology* therefore offers "eschatological enhancements"[257] to doctrines not usually associated with eschatology. In these, Beale notes the redemptive benefits of God's prior acts, while also remembering that "…Christians

254. Beale, *NTBT*, 23-25.
255. Beale, *NTBT*, 18.
256. Beale, *NTBT*, 24.
257. Beale, *NTBT*, 24.

experience only a part of what will be completely experienced in the final form of the new heavens and earth."[258]

These eschatological enhancements run throughout Beale's project.[259] For example, the eschatological dynamic is evident in Beale's discussion of salvation and justification.[260] Beale notes Scriptural evidence for believers having already experienced salvation; they were justified in the past.[261] Yet, Beale also notes, Scripture looks to a future demonstration of believers' justification, when they will be saved fully.[262] Salvation today is both already and not yet. Beale writes:

> Believers have begun to be saved from bondage to Satan and from final judgment through Christ's death and resurrection…Nevertheless, it is clear that Satan is still active in blinding unbelievers…Satan's initial defeat occurred at Christ's victorious death and resurrection, and his complete defeat will happen at the very end when Christ comes to consummate his kingdom in final victory over the forces of evil. The saints' inaugurated salvation is also from spiritual death, over which Satan rules (Eph. 2:1-5), and this salvation is completed at the end when believers are freed also from physical death by resurrection.[263]

Thus, Beale views salvation and justification in inaugurated eschatological perspective; he describes both as having past, present, and future aspects for believers today.

Pertinent for this key idea of Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency, Beale also views the fulfillment of the Adamic commission through the prism of inaugurated eschatology. Adam's commission is both already and not yet fulfilled. The fulfillment of the Adamic commission began, Beale writes, with Jesus; his birth, death, resurrection, and ascension marked the Adamic commission's initial fulfillment.[264] The commission is now progressively being

---

258. Beale, *NTBT*, 17.
259. E.g., Beale, *NTBT*, 469-526, 899-904, 932-936.
260. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 899-907.
261. Beale, *NTBT*, 901.
262. Beale, *NTBT*, 902-905.
263. Beale, *NTBT*, 902f.
264. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 353-354.

fulfilled by Jesus through the ministries of the Church, and will be fulfilled finally at Christ's second advent.[265] The fulfillment of the Adamic commission today is therefore described as both already and not yet.

Analysis and Critique

In his *Christian Theology: An Introduction*, Alister McGrath notes that Albert Schweitzer sparked a new era in New Testament scholarship by discussing Jesus's teaching in eschatological terms.[266] McGrath observes that this era gave rise to three positions regarding eschatology, 1) the futurist position, which holds that "the kingdom of God is something which remains in the future, and will intervene disruptively in…human history," 2) the inaugurated position, which holds that "the kingdom of God has begun to exercise its influence within human history, although its full realization and fulfillment lie in the future," and 3) the realized position, which holds that "the kingdom of God has already been realized in the coming of Jesus."[267]

Though McGrath's account might have included more discussion of the development of the inaugurated eschatological position by mentioning, for example, the work of Geerhardus Vos,[268] his analysis nevertheless grants a helpful backdrop in which to contextualize Beale's *A New Testament Biblical Theology*. Beale explicitly holds to the middle, inaugurated, position,[269] which aims to incorporate the strengths of both the realized and the futurist positions.[270] In this

265. Beale, *NTBT*, 893f, 913-916.

266. Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology*, 562.

267. Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology*, 562f.

268. Geerhardus Vos and Richard B. Gaffin, *The Pauline Eschatology* (Phillipsburg, New Jersey: Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co, 1994).

269. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 19.

270. Cf. Beale, *NTBT*, 19fn76.

Beale follows directly upon the work of Oscar Cullmann[271] and George E. Ladd,[272] and upon Dutch Calvinists Geerhardus Vos[273] and Herman Ridderbos.[274]

Beale's *A New Testament Biblical Theology* also bears some formal similarity to Rudolf Bultmann's work.[275] Bultmann also sought to incorporate eschatological considerations into the whole of his New Testament theology,[276] though Bultmann's agenda to demythologize the message of the New Testament cuts short his extensive treatment of these eschatological aspects.[277] In form, however, in seems that Beale is continuing something like what Bultmann began: considering the entire message of the New Testament with eschatology in mind.

Thus, Beale's incorporation of an inaugurated eschatological position does not, in itself, represent an innovation; neither is his incorporation of eschatological considerations throughout his *A New Testament Biblical Theology* a new development in the history of New Testament theologies. What makes Beale's project distinct is its incorporation of the narrative of the Old Testament into its consideration of the New Testament in conjunction with its comprehensive concern for inaugurated eschatology. The result is that, in Beale's reflection, the lens of inaugurated eschatology refracts the entire canon of Scripture rather than just the New Testament or the teachings of Jesus. Though such an inaugurated eschatological reading of the entirety of Scripture is not

---

271. Oscar Cullmann, *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History*, trans. Floyd V. Filson (Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Westminster Press, 1964).

272. George E. Ladd, *The Gospel of the Kingdom* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975) 24, where Ladd defines the kingdom of God in inaugurated eschatological terms, noting that Schweitzer's futurist analysis was correct; he later also affirms Dodd's realized position (40). Beale regularly cites Ladd in *NTBT*, esp. 429-438.

273. Geerhardus Vos and Richard B. Gaffin, *The Pauline Eschatology*.

274. Herman Ridderbos, *The Coming of the Kingdom* (Edinburgh: Christian World Publications, 1979). Cf. Beale, *NTBT*, 24fn93.

275. Beale, *NTBT*, 19fn74. See also 113.

276. Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Scribner, 1951).

277. Beale, *NTBT*, 19fn74.

absent from recent Dutch Calvinist systematic theology,[278] this feature of Beale's reflection makes it, to date, distinctive among biblical theologies.

This distinctiveness forms the backdrop for how Beale understands the outworking of the Adamic commission. It allows him to claim, with internal consistency, that Adam's commission is both already and not yet fulfilled: that Jesus's birth, death, resurrection, and ascension marked the Adamic commission's inaugurated fulfillment,[279] and its final fulfillment will occur at Christ's Second Coming.[280] Concomitantly, the restoration of the viceregency of humanity has been inaugurated in Christ, and yet awaits his Second Coming for its full manifestation.

Chapter 3 noted New Testament scholar Howard Marshall's objection to Beale's ubiquitous use of the term "eschatology."[281] Marshall's critique did not seem to grapple with the fact that, for Beale, the present world is itself eschatological.[282] Yet Marshall's objection does raise another issue: if everything is eschatological – that is, if every era and every event of history is, in a sense, eschatological – then why the need to say it repeatedly?

It seems that there is something beyond "eschatology" to which Beale is referring. To revisit his own explanation of why he has integrated eschatology throughout his project, his aim was to view the contemporary life of believers "within the climaxing context of redemptive history."[283] It seems that Beale's repeated use of the term "eschatological" functions as a proposal for what the contemporary world is in this "climaxing context": a world where God in Christ

---

278. Cf. Gordon J. Spykman, *Reformational Theology: A New Paradigm for Doing Dogmatics* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992) 522. Following Anthony Hoekema, Spykman writes that eschatology is "an integral aspect of all biblical revelation."

279. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 353-354.

280. E.g. Beale, *NTBT*, 893f, 913-916.

281. I. Howard Marshall, "Review of *A New Testament Biblical Theology* by Gregory K. Beale," *Themelios* 37.2 (July 2012) 307-310.

282. Beale, *NTBT*, 23.

283. Beale, *NTBT*, 18.

has worked, is working, and will work. This proposal implies an immediacy to God's work in the present, an ideological equivalent to the phrase, "the kingdom of God is at hand," yet also leaves room to consider what the Christian God's future acts will bring to the creation.

But what does this have to do with preaching? How does this unique stance of Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency contribute to the viceregal homiletic?

Summative Statements About Preaching

Just as Christ has taken his place at the right hand of the Father, the authority of preaching has been established. However, like Christ, the legitimacy and authority of preaching will not be manifest fully until the Second Coming.

Three points develop this basic insight.

First, Beale's incorporation of inaugurated eschatology implies the viceregal act of preaching today results from the enthronement of Jesus. Preaching is therefore a sign to the world of that enthronement. It is a foretaste of Christ's full enthronement over creation.

Second, because, as discussed above in key idea two, the preacher identifies with Christ, the preacher is himself participating in Christ's inaugurated enthronement over creation. Preaching, then, is not only a sign of Christ being enthroned over creation, but represents redeemed humanity participating in that inaugurated enthronement. Preaching is a foretaste of how redeemed humanity in Christ will function when enthroned over creation; *it is a foretaste of humanity's glorification.* Further, the speech of the preacher is speech which has come under the redemption of God in Christ, and therefore functions, as Adam's speech was intended, to image God in and to creation.

Third, the fact that we do not yet see all things subject to Christ (Hebrews 2:8-9) grants insight into why the act of Christian preaching does not always manifest perceivably divine power or authority over the creation. Preachers have

not been restored fully in the image of God; *preachers speak and act imperfectly until the Last Day*. Moreover, the congregation has not been restored fully in the image of God; they therefore imperfectly behold God's glory and falter in hearing God's words. Moreover, creation is not fully subdued to God in Christ; the Church, including the act of preaching, is therefore susceptible to the activities of demonic, unclean spirits, and the beast-like systems of oppression, injustice, and deception which mark the time between Christ's two advents.

Any act of preaching today therefore, by virtue of its Christian character, remains inextricably linked to both the past and the future mighty acts of God's redemption of the world in Jesus Christ. Preaching exemplifies and manifests, prefigures and works towards, God's redemptive work in Jesus Christ.

In this way, Beale's key idea that Adam's mission is eschatological in nature informs the viceregal homiletic.

This chapter has discussed Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency by discussing four key ideas, and has developed five summative statements those key ideas imply about preaching.

1. Preaching images God; it is a sign of his rule and presence on earth.
2. Preaching is a human act which expands the reign of God.
3. Preachers participate in Christ's viceregency.
4. The authority of preaching is not dominating.
5. Preaching is a foretaste of humanity's glorification.

We now move to conclude our chapter's discussion of Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency and how it informs the viceregal homiletic.

Conclusion

Beale's Understanding of Christian Viceregency

The purpose of this chapter has been to present and critically engage Beale's unique understanding of Christian viceregency. This discussion has served to

clarify what the viceregal homiletic means when it says that the preacher is a Christian viceregent. Further, however, and pertinent for the argument of this entire thesis, our discussion has shown how Beale's unique understanding of Christian viceregency informs the viceregal homiletic as a new and distinct model for homiletical reflection.

As noted above, the viceregal homiletic particularizes for homiletical reflection Beale's idea that all Christians are viceregents. The viceregal homiletic states that the preacher is a Christian viceregent: a human who, through the work of Christ, expresses God's rule over the creation. The chapter began by summarizing Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency, and then discussed Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency by identifying four key ideas within it. Beale does not explicitly list these four ideas, but each provided a point at which to clarify how Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency is the same or different than other understandings. The four key ideas are:

1) Adam's identity "in the image of God" is congruent with Adam's mission "to rule over and subdue."
2) Christians today identify with Jesus Christ, who is the one viceregent.
3) Adam's mission was intended to expand Eden.
4) Adam's mission would be eschatologically completed.

Several insights emerged from this discussion.

First, Beale's understanding of "in the image of God" has significant commonality with the understanding of several Dutch Calvinist scholars. The chapter demonstrated that though Beale does not argue for why Adam should be thought of only according to his rule, Beale's implied support of this position placed him with a majority of scholars in understanding Adam's identity and rule. Beale's understanding of Adam's identity was also noted to fit more consistently with the Dutch Calvinist model of threefold relationship than did Hoekema's.

Regarding the second key idea, the discussion suggested that Beale understands "identifying with Christ" to mean "being united with Christ and

experiencing the benefits of his resurrection." This understanding of identification was seen as key to Beale's Christian viceregency because it illuminates how Christians today participate and benefit from Christ's viceregency over creation. Further, the idea that Jesus is the one true viceregent was shown by visiting five facets of Beale's work: a) Christ the Old Testament "son of God", b) Christ the king who images God, c) Christ the "son of man", d) Christ as obedient in temptation, and e) Christ the keeper and filler of creation. The discussion then suggested that Beale's reading of the Synoptics in light of Pauline language, a decision without critical defense from Beale, might better be considered as part of a Childsian Christocentric rereading of Scripture. This suggestion extended Chapter 3's argument that Beale's entire project exhibits characteristics of Brevard Childs's method for biblical theology, and again suggested that Beale's work may not cohere within the methodological categories he uses to describe it.

Regarding the third key idea, this chapter's discussion noted how Beale understands the expanding intent of Adam's mission. The discussion differentiated Beale's understanding of extending Eden from Rushdoony's theonomic understanding of Christians taking dominion. It was shown that Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency implied that Christians exert dominion according to the ironic character and pattern of Christ's rule; this differed fromRushdoony's vision for Christians to gain societal dominance.

Regarding the fourth key idea, this chapter noted that in Beale's reflection, the lens of inaugurated eschatology refracts the entire canon of Scripture rather than just the New Testament or the teachings of Jesus. Though such an inaugurated eschatological reading of the entirety of Scripture is not absent from recent Dutch Calvinist systematic theology, this feature of Beale's reflection makes it distinctive among biblical theologies. The discussion suggested that Beale's ubiquitous use of the term "eschatology" might be taken as commentary regarding reality as centered on the Christian God of Christian Scripture.

Implications for the Thesis as a Whole

In summary, then, inasmuch as the discussion of this chapter is accurate, Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency is unique among recent reflection on viceregency, particularly in the four key areas noted, and the appropriation of Beale's work renders the viceregal homiletic a new and distinct model for reflecting on Christian preaching.

Discussing Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency has unearthed two implications which clarify and develop the prior three chapters' discussion – first, the viceregal homiletic proceeds in a theological mode of reflection on preaching, and second, the viceregal homiletic offers a synthetic, Lintsian theological vision of preaching, a biblical-theological unified center from which to reflect on the act of preaching.

Chapter 1 argued that contemporary homiletics has neglected to consider the act of preaching theologically; that is, homiletical reflection has focused more on how to preach a good sermon than how preaching, as a whole, operates in God's world. Chapter 1 also noted that, as a result of its rhetorical emphasis, contemporary North American homiletics has struggled to provide an ongoing appraisal of preaching's uniquely Christian character and mission.

This chapter's discussion of the concept of viceregency shows that the viceregal homiletic provides a fresh approach. In centralizing the statement that the preacher is a viceregent of God, the viceregal homiletic considers directly the preacher in relation to the Christian God; it proceeds in a theological mode. In this way, the viceregal homiletic positions itself to give an ordered account of how preaching is a uniquely Christian activity. Homiletical reflection emanating from the concept of viceregency, then, is distinct from existing homiletical reflection.

Secondly, as Chapter 2 noted, existing theological reflection on preaching lacks a Scripturally unified ideological center. Existing homiletics in the theological mode were seen to produce helpful pieces of reflection on what preaching is, yet were often unconcerned with how those discrete insights fit into

a larger ideological structure reflecting the entire canon of Scripture, or would skew discussions of preaching according to systematic categories. Chapter 2 suggested that contemporary homiletical reflection would be helped by summative statements about preaching which synthesize all of Scripture, including what Scripture says about God's future acts of redemption. Chapter 3 then showed how Beale's biblical-theological method was appropriate for producing these summative statements about preaching.

This chapter demonstrated that Beale's understanding of viceregency enhances homiletical reflection by providing a unified theological center: a synthesizing idea which is itself integrated into the larger ideological structure of the canon of Scripture. The preacher as a viceregent is a stable image of what preachers are at all times and in all places: a typal rendering of the preacher which captures timeless and essential characteristics shared by acts of Christian preaching in every epoch of redemptive history. In this way, the viceregal homiletic unifies its reflection on Christian preaching in a way that contemporary homiletical reflection in the biblical-theological mode has not done.

From this unified ideological center, the chapter showed that the viceregal homiletic makes summative statements regarding what Christian preaching is, and began to articulate those statements. They are:

1. Preaching images God; it is a sign of his rule and presence on earth.
2. Preaching is a human act which expands the reign of God.
3. Preachers participate in Christ's viceregency.
4. The authority of Christian preaching is not dominating.
5. Preaching is a foretaste of humanity's glorification.

We move now to our concluding chapter, which will discuss the viceregal homiletic in relation to three existing homiletics influential in North America.

CHAPTER 5

Introduction

The central claim of this thesis is that the viceregal homiletic is a new and distinct model for homiletical reflection because it considers the preacher as a Christian viceregent, following G.K. Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency.

The prior four chapters of this thesis have explored this claim and shown its validity. Chapter 1 argued that theological reflection uniquely allows homileticians to consider Christian preaching's distinctly Christian character and mission, and that much of contemporary North America homiletics neglects this mode of reflection. The viceregal homiletic's theological focus differentiates it from much of contemporary homiletical reflection in North America.

Building on Chapter 1, Chapter 2 differentiated the viceregal homiletic's theological reflection on Christian preaching from other existing contemporary theological reflection on Christian preaching in North America. The viceregal homiletic uses and extends a biblical-theological method to develop its central image. Thus, the viceregal homiletic is distinct.

Chapters 3 and 4 elucidated the viceregal homiletic more directly, showing how Beale's biblical-theological method (Chapter 3) and understanding of Christian viceregency (Chapter 4) inform the viceregal homiletic's central image and reflection. No existing published homiletic in North America incorporates biblical theological methodology as consistently or comprehensively as the viceregal homiletic, neither does any existing homiletic draw explicitly from Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency. Chapters 3 and 4, then, began to show how the viceregal homiletic is not only distinct from existing homiletical reflection in North America, but also is a new homiletical model.

Yet beyond arguing that Beale's biblical-theological method and his understanding of Christian viceregency make the viceregal homiletic a new

homiletical model, the thesis has not fully traced out the viceregal homiletic's distinctiveness among existing homiletics. Further, if, as Chapter 1 suggested, theological reflection uniquely opens the ability for homiletics to give account of Christian preaching's Christian character, and if, as Chapter 2 suggested, the viceregal homiletic proceeds in a biblical-theological manner unmatched by other homiletics, the viceregal homiletic should be able to produce some fresh biblical-theological statements about Christian preaching. Specifically, it should offer some account of how Christian preaching – past, present, and future – fits into the Christian God's creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Jesus Christ.

Purpose of this Chapter

This final chapter will offer such an account as it places the viceregal homiletic in dialogue with three existing homiletics: those of Jason Meyer, Thomas Long, and John Stott. The three sections of this chapter will engage Meyer, Long, and Stott, and differentiate how the viceregal homiletic's vision of Christian preaching fits into God's creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Jesus Christ. This account will complete the discussions of the four prior chapters of this thesis, and will show how the viceregal homiletic is a fresh and distinct homiletical model.

We move now to the first of our three sections. Because Chapter 2's discussion began an examination of Jason Meyer's homiletic, our analysis at this point will summarize that examination. This section's differentiation of the viceregal homiletic from Meyer's work will then produce a central contribution of this chapter to the argument of this thesis: the viceregal homiletic's five homiletical foci.

Jason Meyer: Preacher as Steward and Herald

Chapter 2 of this thesis noted Jason Meyer's *Preaching: A Biblical Theology* as a key example of the biblical-theological mode of homiletical reflection. The biblical-theological mode of homiletical reflection aims to retain the structure of the

Scriptural witness as it describes the act of Christian preaching through successive eras of the canonical narrative. Meyer thus traces what he terms the "stewardship of God's word,"[1] through successive eras of redemptive history, showing its historic continuity as well as the multiple forms it takes in the canon.

Chapter 2 also observed that the biblical-theological mode of homiletical reflection, of which Meyer's work is one example, presupposes that Christian preaching has its own reality which manifests in multiform ways during different eras of canonical history. The biblical-theological task of tracing out how redemptive history unfolds aims to give a customized account of this reality. This is theological reflection about Christian preaching rather than theology repurposed to describe Christian preaching.

Meyer's work within the biblical-theological mode of reflection, though inherently strong, leaves some questions unanswered. One might ask of Meyer's reflection: how is Christian preaching today not merely heralding and stewarding, but a repetition of God's previous activity of creating and redeeming? How will God's future redemption in regards to Christian preaching mirror his acts of old?

In Contrast: the Viceregal Homiletic

As Chapter 2 asserted, the viceregal homiletic surveys Scripture so as to synthesize and sum up the results of its biblical theology into a unified understanding of what Scripture says about Christian preaching. In this way it aims to produce a Lintsian theological vision through which to view contemporary Christian preaching. The viceregal homiletic is thus able to surpass Meyer's biblical-theological reflection on Christian preaching by seeing contemporary Christian preaching in light of the progress of God's redemption. Like Meyer, this vision draws on the entire canonical narrative in biblical-

1. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching: A Biblical Theology* (Wheaton, Illinois: CrossWay, 2014) 75-236.

theological fashion, yet unlike Meyer, it produces a synthesis which reflects Christian preaching's uniquely Christian character.

The viceregal homiletic's vision of Christian preaching is centered upon the idea that the preacher is a Christian viceregent. Describing the preacher as a Christian viceregent reflects the viceregal homiletic's attempt, extending Beale's work, to synthesize by a biblical-theological process all of Scripture's insights about a preacher into a single summative and integrative idea, and then to use that idea to scrutinize and describe Christian preaching.

Thus, the viceregal homiletic's central image is produced not, as Meyer's central image seems to do, by looking at Scripture for how faithful people have preached in different eras. Neither is it produced by looking at Christian preaching today and asserting that a particular image describes it. Rather, by biblically-theologically constructing a single image out of all of Scripture the viceregal homiletic brings that central image to bear on all acts of Christian preaching.

Thus, save for Meyer's lack of synthesis, the viceregal homiletic is somewhat similar to Meyer's homiletic. Yet the fundamental difference between the two involves the viceregal homiletic's central image, *the preacher as viceregent*, and its ideological breadth relative to Meyer's *preacher as steward and herald.* To illustrate this difference we will return to an insightful passage in Meyer's book, where he addresses assembling a theology of Christian preaching based solely on Scriptures with "preaching words" in them:

> …reducing preaching to what can be gleaned from word studies on "preaching words" can often result in committing the "word equals concept" fallacy. The flawed premise here is that the concept of preaching shows up only when the words for preaching are present…[T]here is nothing wrong with using a text to serve as a summary of preaching…However, if one relies on proof-texting too much, preaching loses its cumulative, holistic biblical meaning.[2]

2. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 316f.

Meyer's point here is that the concept of preaching, and particularly what the canon of Scripture might say to preachers today regarding their calling and task, is communicated through more than the verses of Scripture which address preaching directly. Responsible homiletics, Meyer implies, requires a wider scope of inquiry. Meyer's way of resolving this is to pursue "a holistic biblical theology that focuses not just on preaching, but also on the ministry of the word."[3] According to this reading per Meyer, the preacher is one who heralds and stewards, and Meyer thus surveys heralding and stewarding through the canon.

As Chapter 2 noted, Meyer's insight here is correct and helpful. Yet when compared to the viceregal homiletic, it becomes clear that Meyer's scope of inquiry could have been wider still. The viceregal homiletic assumes that reducing Christian preaching only to what can be gleaned from biblical-theological readings about men who stewarded God's word is also too narrow a focus.

In contrast, the premise of the viceregal homiletic is that Scripture's account of humanity is what informs fundamentally the concept of Christian preaching. The viceregal homiletic therefore constructs its biblical theology of Christian preaching by tracing the concept of humanity made in the image of God. It assumes that the call and task of Christian preaching coheres within the call and task of humanity, and not merely in acts of stewarding and heralding. This analysis allows the viceregal homiletic to reflect on everything Meyer's homiletic includes, yet also to consider how stewarding and heralding intersects with humanity's identity as made in God's image. Particularly, it allows consideration of how God's creation of humanity in his image, humanity's disobedience, and Christ's redemption and consummation play into that intersection.

---

3. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 318. He defines "ministry of the word" as "stewarding and heralding God's word in such as way that people encounter God through his word." Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 31. Cf. 22-25.

Following Beale, the viceregal homiletic notes that Jesus Christ both represents and effects the redemption of humanity imaging God. Humanity in Christ retrieves its ability and mission to image God in creation; from the venue of their humanity, then, preachers attempt legitimately to represent and speak for the Christian God. This is not to say, however, that preachers do not have functions: for example, preachers function to announce the gospel message that God has exerted his reign in Jesus Christ, and that men and women must repent of their sins, place their faith in Christ, and seek to live godly lives in congruence with the teaching of Scripture. However a homiletician parses the different functions of a preacher – in Meyer's case, he highlights stewarding and heralding – the viceregal homiletic holds that the preacher's humanity is inextricable from and logically prior to his functioning. The preacher's humanity is the venue of Christ's redemption, and is therefore the seat of any and all beneficial functions the preacher might perform.

To develop this further, we turn now to the five homiletical foci of the viceregal homiletic. These five foci represent the viceregal homiletic extending into homiletics the five summative statements, noted in Chapter 4, from Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency.

First, the viceregal homiletic holds that the ultimate ground of Christian preaching is Jesus Christ. Christ is the paradigmatic viceregent in whom preachers participate. Such a position for reflecting on Christian preaching goes further than understanding Christian preaching merely to steward and herald God's words. It holds that Christ has not only commanded preachers to communicate clearly the message and intent of Scripture to a contemporary audience, but that Christ himself, in viceregal identity, power, and function, preaches, and has redeemed preachers so that they might preach in and through him. Redemption has joined preachers with Christ's own body and mission, affirming preachers' humanity and noble position as images of God within creation, and rendering their lives and words able to witness obediently to his work and will. Per the viceregal homiletic, then, the project of Christian

preaching coheres not merely as an obedient human act like stewarding or heralding, but as a multifaceted interconnection of particular results of Christ's redemption of the world, which enables the preacher to attempt, faithfully and congruently, to speak God's words.[4] Such an attempt occurs within the context of the preacher's redeemed human identity, and is therefore a re-exertion of godly viceregal rule in the creation. Per the viceregal homiletic, then, Christian preaching is both a specific product and an indication of the remaking of all things in Christ. This image places the person and action of preachers into the canonical metanarrative's account of God's creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Jesus Christ, and in doing this captures the insight *that Christian preaching is grounded in the person and work of Jesus.*

Second, the viceregal homiletic captures the insight that *Christian preaching is a Christian practice.* Preaching is a Christian practice not simply because a Christian practices it, nor because of the divine origin of Christian Scripture, but by the nature of the entire act itself. Preaching is more than public speaking, and thus homiletics is the venue to discuss whether and how the preacher speaks for God, and not just any God, but God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Here we see again that the viceregal homiletic is positioned to explain homiletics' distinctly Christian character and mission, and therefore to address the lacuna in contemporary homiletical reflection in North America noted in Chapter 1 of this thesis.

The viceregal homiletic simultaneously maintains an ideological space to consider Christian preaching as a preacher's act. In viceregal perspective, an act of Christian preaching is an act of a preacher, renewed in his humanity in Christ, and thus restored to his viceregal role in creation. The act of Christian preaching, then, is a human responsibility which requires the obedient exercise of

---

4. Cf. Geoffrey Stevenson, "Forming Future Preachers" in *The Future of Preaching*. ed. Geoffrey Stevenson (Norwich, England: SCM Press, 2010) 203. "Preaching in the future will only be preaching if it remembers that it is, *sui generis*, a unique activity in which the inexpressible wonder of the mercy of God in Christ Jesus miraculously and for brief, brilliant moments shines and takes shape in the clay of the faltering words of all-too-human preachers."

the preacher's human will. Rhetoric, inasmuch as it represents a discipline which seeks to identify the available means of persuasion in a given situation,[5] is therefore a legitimate part of Christian preaching and homiletics. All particular acts of Christian preaching, therefore, as well as the project of Christian preaching as a whole, are inextricable from whether and how preachers choose to exercise their wills obediently. Preaching can be considered an exercise of dominion, in that it involves the preacher wisely ordering creation as he makes decisions on how best to articulate the words and actions of his sermon. Thus, the viceregal homiletic accounts for Christian preaching being defined by the choices of the preacher.

Preaching involves a human functionalizing the redemption he has received, a redemption which does not remove the preacher from creation, but which aligns with the preacher's viceregal role within it. Preaching, then, is not an act which eclipses the humanity of the preacher, nor any of his alignments with God or creation. Rather, it ushers the preacher towards the fullness of redeemed humanity in Jesus Christ, and therefore integrates him in creation in an unprecedented manner. Preaching is done by a Christian, speaking under God, in and to creation, on behalf of the God and Father of Jesus. *Preaching is a Christian practice.*

Third, at this point we can see how the viceregal homiletic views preaching as a result of both divine action and human action: the divine action which created all things and then sent the Son into the world to redeem it, and the human action of Jesus Christ, in which the preacher participates. Christ's redemption has brought human action back into alignment with divine action; regarding the preacher, the act of Christian preaching is inherently suited for a redeemed human to perform. Extending the Edenic scenes in which Beale's definition of viceregency is rooted, Christ's death and resurrection has placed preachers into an Edenic position; they have regained the duty of the Adamic

5. Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1:2.

commission to expand the reign and presence of God, and are therefore obligated and empowered, in and through Christ, to rule over, subdue, and fill the earth. The human choices made by the preacher as he preaches, then, can fill the earth with the knowledge of the glory of the Lord. Thus, the viceregal homiletic captures the insight that, as a redeemed human, *the preacher images God on earth, and thus expands the kingdom of God in creation.*

The fourth insight emerges here. As just stated, the idea that the preacher is a Christian viceregent relates Christian preaching to Adam's rule in Eden. Noting this association between Adamic rule and Christian preaching positions the viceregal homiletic to consider how Christian speech today exerts and expands God's reign. The viceregal homiletic infers that the authority of Christian preaching is Christ's Adamic, viceregal authority in which the preacher participates. The authority of the preacher's speech is not a divine power unconnected to the existing patterns of divine action in creation, but a particular authority rooted in the Christian God's particular acts of creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Christ. *The authority of the preacher's speech derives from the viceregal authority of Jesus.* Further, the pattern of how Jesus exerts authority in his life, death, and resurrection is paradigmatic and prescriptive for how Christian preaching speech exerts divine authority.

Finally, the viceregal homiletic sees Christian preaching as part of the Christian God's expanding, eschatological project of bringing all things in submission to Christ. Preachers participate in Christ's viceregency, yet that viceregency is not yet fully manifest in creation, and will not be until Christ's return. This means that the viceregal activity of Christian preaching does image God on earth today, yet does so imperfectly. Preachers today only incompletely share in Christ's viceregency; Christian preaching thus only sometimes extends the kingdom reign of God, and the viceregal speech of preachers only imperfectly carries the authority and truth of God. The viceregal homiletic, then, accounts for the fact that preachers can, and do, err; sin is not yet altogether purged from the creation, and therefore is still present in the Christian preacher. Further,

even if a preacher did not err in a sermon, even if a preacher could preach a perfect sermon, the kingdom of God might not go forward to the same extent or in the same way in each instance of Christian preaching.

By extension, then, Christian preaching being a part of God's eschatological project of bringing all things in submission to Christ means that preachers, like all Christians, look forward to a time when they personally will receive the fullness of their redemption in Christ and participate fully in his reign over the renewed creation. Specifically, preachers await the day when they will speak in complete congruence with Scripture and the Christian God, unhindered by their own sin, the opposition of Satan, and the hard-heartedness of the people of God. The viceregal homiletic thus holds that Christian preaching is in part defined by the preacher's anticipation and foretaste of his own future glorification.

Finally, this insight from the viceregal homiletic infers that, at that future redemption of the preacher, the speech of the preacher will come into full congruence with the divine intention for human speech, and will thus reflect and communicate perfectly the truth and power of God. The viceregal homiletic holds that Christian preaching involves a redeemed person, a preacher, submitting their own speech to the prior speech of God so that the sermon itself participates in this future hope. The viceregal homiletic can therefore see expository preaching as a reliable and efficient way for the preacher's speech to align with God's speech, and therefore to strive towards the telos of all human speaking.

Per the viceregal homiletic then, Christian preaching exemplifies not only how to read and understand Scripture, but exemplifies how humanity is to speak in the creation of the Christian God. *Preaching is part of God's eschatological project of bringing all things in submission to Christ, and is a foretaste of fallen humanity and its speech being brought fully into that submission.*

Our discussion has traced out five homiletical foci which the viceregal homiletic develops from the four summative statements of Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency. Summarized, they are as follows:

A) Preaching is a Christian practice.
B) Christian preaching is grounded in the person and work of Jesus.
C) Preaching is a human act; the preacher images God on earth, and Christian preaching expands the kingdom of God in creation.
D) The authority of the preacher's speech derives from the viceregal authority of Jesus.
E) Preaching is part of God's eschatological project of bringing all things in submission to Christ, and is a foretaste of fallen humanity and its speech being brought into that submission.

The preacher as a Christian viceregent, then, portrays Christian preaching to be a Christian practice whose identity and shape is rooted in the Christian God's creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Jesus Christ. It infers that Christian preaching today, or in any era of history, is like Adam's rule in Eden, and that the speech of the preacher participates in Christ's viceregal authority, an authority which is now truly manifest in creation, but which will be perfected at the Last Day.

As noted, the viceregal homiletic proceeds in a theological mode of reflection on Christian preaching, which allows homiletical reflection to examine the preacher in view of the Christian God. Such a stance allows the viceregal homiletic to give an account of Christian preaching's distinctly Christian character, rather than simply explaining it as human communication. Further, this allows for homiletical reflection to remain connected to the rest of the Christian intellectual tradition's witness to the Christian God, for it connects Christian preaching to God's acts of creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Christ.

Chapter 2 suggested that the viceregal homiletic more fully exploits its biblical-theological engagement with Scripture than Meyer's homiletic does. More of this contrast has now come into view. Meyer's biblical-theological process does not provide the preacher with a central image rooted in the biblical-theological fabric of Scripture itself.[6] There is nothing objectionable about Meyer's understanding that preachers today should "steward and herald the word of God"; his homiletic does show that men in every era of the biblical narrative have done so, and infers rightly that preachers should do so in the present. From a methodological perspective, however, Meyer's biblical-theological analysis, with a few possible exceptions,[7] does not demonstrate that stewarding or heralding has undergone an organic process of development through each era of redemptive history. Meyer's discussion, then, though it claims to be biblical-theological, does not exhaust biblical theology's ability to exhibit the process of redemption: to suggest that, for example, the Church's stewarding of the word of God might be qualitatively or quantitatively different than the prophets' or the patriarchs' earlier stewarding and heralding. One result of this deficiency in Meyer's reflection is that, while its discussion does note that instances of stewarding and heralding mentioned in the canon are similar to instances of Christian preaching today, Meyer's homiletic does not describe Christian preaching today according to the progression of the biblical metanarrative. It does not demonstrate how examples of "stewarding and heralding" in a particular era are the same or different than those of an earlier or later era, and therefore cannot delineate how Christian preaching today is different than the stewarding and heralding of eras past or future.

Another way of expressing this difference between Meyer's homiletic and the viceregal homiletic is as follows: unlike the viceregal homiletic, Meyer's work

---

6. The following section of this chapter, engaging the reflection of Thomas Long, will more clearly define a homiletic having a "central image" for the preacher.

7. Meyer does hold that Christ is the "perfect and preeminent steward of the Father's word." Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching,* 306.

does not centralize the shared humanity of all preachers. Instead, the beginning of Meyer's book moves in a different direction:

> The central question of this book is, what is preaching?...The ministry of the word flows from the fact that God entrusts his people with his word. His people take that word and faithfully serve others with it...My thesis is that the ministry of the word in Scripture is *stewarding and heralding God's word in such a way that people encounter God through his word.*[8]

Here Meyer begins his discussion of what Christian preaching is. His proposed definition for "the ministry of the word," of which Christian preaching is a part, is "stewarding and heralding God's word in such a way that people encounter God through his word."[9] Meyer structures portions of the book around this central definition,[10] though it seems that the idea of stewarding takes a more central role in his reflection than heralding or encountering.[11]

Nevertheless, observing Meyer's definition raises a key point for our current discussion. It seems that Meyer does not imply that preachers are unified essentially in a call to preach, nor in a common humanity, but in a particular function, that is, in "stewarding and heralding God's word in such a way that people encounter God..."[12] While it seems clear that Meyer also sees preachers as accountable to God,[13] and therefore as human persons living in the Christian God's world, Meyer's discussion regularly emphasizes the right functioning of "stewarding the word" without much mention of the human identity of the one stewarding. For example, in his discussion of "paradigm shifts in the stewardship pattern,"[14] he asserts that, though the "identity" and "titles" of the stewards change in different time periods, the "basic job description," what the stewards

---

8. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 21, italics in original.
9. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 21.
10. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 21-25, 209-216, and perhaps 241-252.
11. E.g. the titles of Chapters 5-16, Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 9.
12. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 21.
13. E.g. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 34f.
14. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 69-72.

are supposed to do, does not change.[15] In this way, Meyer seems to imply that preachers are unified throughout the canon and history by their common function of stewarding, apart from their human personhoods.

If this is an accurate reading of Meyer's work, it raises several questions. Other existing homiletical reflection, particularly reflection in the rhetorical mode noted in Chapter 1,[16] can tend to imply that preachers are united only in a common function, namely, in the act of Christian preaching. Purely rhetorical analyses tend to imply that a preacher is identified by the fact that he preaches, or by how he prepares to preach and what he does when preaching.[17] Yet stating that a preacher is merely someone who functions in a certain way underappreciates the human personhood of the preacher. Concurrently, it may also imply that the Trinity's redemptive work, of which the preacher as a human person is assumedly a recipient, has little effect on the preacher's function.

While Meyer's work does not centralize the humanity of the preacher in the same way the viceregal homiletic does, it is notable that the concept does arise when Meyer mentions the preacher as sinner or as one who might usurp God. Meyer almost always addresses humanity in this light;[18] one short paragraph[19] is all Meyer offers concerning positive aspects that may accrue from the preacher's redeemed humanity. A discerning reader might wonder whether a theological homiletic that treats humanness almost exclusively as a liability, as Meyer's does, is equipped to describe something like Christian preaching, an act so inextricable from the preacher's unique personality and rhetorical choices. Concomitantly,

---

15. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 69.

16. Cf. page 15 in Chapter 1.

17. Perhaps relatedly, these analyses remain unable to answer questions regarding the human person of the preacher. For example: is the humanness of the preacher merely incidental to these beneficial functions? Does the life of the preacher have no bearing upon his preaching – apart from improving or degrading his function? Or, more provocatively: could a chimpanzee preach the gospel? Or, perhaps more realistically: might Siri or Alexa one day unseat humanity as the best at "stewarding" the word of God?

18. E.g. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 22, 286, 288f, 295-297, 301-303.

19. Jason C. Meyer, *Preaching*, 244. "The very nature of stewardship means that God's voice will come through the personality and style of the steward and herald."

one might wonder whether Meyer's arc of thought is able to approve of, or give an explanation for, the undeniable varieties of faithful Christian preaching found across the Church in all times and places.[20]

While acknowledging that "stewarding" is a fecund way of describing the function of preachers throughout the ages, the viceregal homiletic differently isolates the essence of the Christian preacher. The preacher, per the viceregal homiletic, is a human redeemed in Jesus Christ and thus reinvested with Christ's viceregal identity and role. The preacher represents and reflects God's glory by proclaiming and explaining God's words in Scripture, towards the end that other humans might grow in Christlikeness and the world be filled with the glory of God. This understanding acknowledges the preacher's function, yet interrelates that function with the preacher's viceregal identity. Put simply, the viceregal homiletic asserts that Christian preaching is one result of the preacher being a Christian, and does not consist merely of the preacher functioning in a certain way.

Per the viceregal homiletic, everything that a preacher might do while preaching has as its defining prerequisite one's redeemed identity in Christ, and therefore one's reanimated Adamic function within creation. For example, the viceregal homiletic affirms that preachers function to steward God's words, but notes that the preacher's Adamic viceregal identity enables and defines this stewarding function. The viceregal homiletic therefore assumes that God does not call or expect human preachers to function any differently than obedient humans. Preaching requires the preacher to deny the sinful nature, but it does not require the preacher to deny his own humanness. This humanness is the venue of Christ's redemption, and through it the preacher receives viceregal authority to preach.

---

20. E.g. the breadth of homiletical approaches illustrated in Hughes O. Old, *The Reading and Preaching of the Scriptures in the Worship of the Christian Church*, 7 volumes. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998-2010).

The viceregal homiletic notes all preachers' humanity and redeemed viceregal role in Christ. This way of connecting contemporary preachers to preachers in other time periods differs from the way Jason Meyer's *Preaching: A Biblical Theology* does, namely by identifying preachers through particular functions. The discussion suggested that Meyer underrecognizes the humanity of the preacher in a way that may disallow fully acknowledging how the preacher's redemption roots and affects the function of the preacher.

In short, the viceregal homiletic begins from an assumption that all preachers are humans, and therefore all preachers throughout history have shared their human identity and its viceregal role in God's creation. This simple insight makes clear how preachers today relate to preachers described in the canon. Thus, rather than proceeding from the idea that all preachers are unified merely by a call to preach the gospel,[21] or by a common function like, per Meyer, stewarding, the viceregal homiletic affirms a greater margin of commonality among preachers: their common humanity and therefore their common, restored viceregal role in creation.

Yet by recognizing this greater commonality among preachers the viceregal homiletic does not delegitimize the call to preach. On the contrary, it aims to throw into sharper relief the fact that God calls human beings to preach, that this call corresponds with God's creation and redemption of humans through Christ, and that, therefore, preachers experience and manifest the Adamic viceregency of Christ when they preach.[22]

---

21. As, for example, in the Reformed tradition. Cf. John Calvin's discussion of "The Doctors and Ministers of the Church, Their Election and Office," severely favors citations from the New Testament over the Old Testament in *The Institutes of the Christian Religion*, 4:3:1-16. See also Ronald S. Wallace, *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament* (Tyler, Texas: Geneva Divinity School, 1982) 117-119.

22. In light of this, the viceregal homiletic affirms, for example, that the Great Commission in Matthew 28:18-20 directly sponsors the contemporary Church's call to preach, but it also views the Matthew 28 commission as a renewal of the Adamic commission of Genesis 1:26-28. The viceregal homiletic therefore considers the preacher's human identity and its role in the creation as essential in understanding the nature of the authority implied by his call, particularized in Matthew 28, to preach.

Due perhaps to this neglect of the preacher's human personhood, Meyer's *Preaching: A Biblical Theology* does not proceed ultimately in a way that describes synthetically how Christian preaching fits within the Christian God's great acts of creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Christ. Instead, it serves to demonstrate that throughout the biblical narratives many obedient people of faith have stewarded and heralded the word of God so that people encountered God.

In contrast, the viceregal homiletic's *preacher as Christian viceregent* central image is rooted in the canonical metanarrative's description of the creation, fall, redemption, and consummation of humans within creation. Per this homiletic, Adam's naming of the animals in Eden[23] is the formal predecessor of all later examples of viceregal speech, and is itself a paradigmatic example of human speech imaging prior divine speech. Humanity's fall into sin[24] affects human speech such that it does not name creation for the glory of God.[25] Yet God's promised redemption begins, in the Old Testament, to reanimate humanity's rightful imaging of God,[26] and therefore their rightful viceregal naming of creation. Instances of the prophets speaking for God in the Old Testament are examples of this initial and episodic redemption of human speech. Christ's death and resurrection both inaugurate and exemplify redeemed humanity's reinvestiture with Adamic viceregal function. The increase of preaching and other attendant speech gifts, including tongues, prophecy, and words of knowledge during the New Testament Church's ministry, demonstrates this. Preaching today finds its place within this expansion of viceregal speech through the Holy Spirit's outpouring, and is a foretaste of when all humans in the new creation will speak only in ways that image and glorify God.

---

23. Genesis 2:19.
24. Genesis 3.
25. E.g. Genesis 4:23f, 11:1-9 esp. v4.
26. Genesis 3:15.

This chapter's discussion has revisited Jason Meyer's *Preaching: A Biblical Theology* in order to demonstrate that the viceregal homiletic is a new and distinct model for homiletical reflection because it considers the preacher as a Christian viceregent, following Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency. Our discussion has suggested that Meyer's reflection does not exhibit the progression of stewarding and heralding through different eras of redemptive history as clearly as it could. Further, while Meyer rightly expanded his scope of inquiry to arrive at what he calls a biblical theology of the ministry of the word – rather than merely assembling texts from Scripture which mention Christian preaching – our discussion noted that the viceregal homiletic pursues its biblical theology of Christian preaching by establishing a biblical theology of viceregency in Christ, in which it locates Christian preaching. This, our discussion suggested, allows the viceregal homiletic to more clearly and consistently reflect on how the function of, to use Meyer's phrase, "heralding and stewarding" interconnects with the humanity of the preacher.

We move now to engage another homiletical model: Thomas Long's *preacher as witness*. Whereas the viceregal homiletic differed from Jason Meyer's homiletical reflection in its fuller use of the biblical-theological method, our engagement with Long's work will show that the viceregal homiletic's central image, *the preacher as a Christian viceregent*, was uniquely developed and chosen.

Thomas Long: Preacher as Witness

Thomas G. Long's *The Witness of Preaching* has been particularly influential in North American homiletics. It ranked on a 2011 survey of North American teachers of Christian preaching of the most influential preaching books of the past 25 years,[27] and a 2017 survey of syllabi of the Association of Theological Schools showed *The Witness of Preaching* to be the single most widely used book

27. Michael Duduit, "The 25 Most Influential Preaching Books Of The Last 25 Years," *Preaching*, February 5, 2010, accessed August 11, 2018, http://www.preaching.com/sermon-illustrations/11625882/.

in North American graduate level preaching classes.[28] *The Witness of Preaching* was first published in 1989 and continues in its third edition, published in 2016.[29]

As the following discussion will note, *The Witness of Preaching* argues explicitly for a central image for the Christian preacher: *the preacher as witness.*[30] The remainder of Long's rhetorical suggestions on how to build a sermon find their foundation in this first chapter's presentation of this image.[31]

Long introduces his central image in conjunction with what he identifies as three "master metaphors" around which "the vast majority of [recent homiletical reflection's] pictures of the preacher can be clustered."[32] Those three master metaphors are: *the preacher as herald*,[33] *the preacher as pastor*,[34] and *the preacher as storyteller/poet.*[35] Because Long claims that the image of *the preacher as witness* incorporates the strengths of these three other images while minimizing their weaknesses,[36] our discussion will summarize his descriptions of each of these three before moving on to examine his image of *the preacher as witness.*

Preacher as Herald

Long notes that the image of *the preacher as herald* brings the key advantage of maintaining Christian preaching's transcendent dimension.[37] Heralding involves bringing a message in the name and authority of another. This creates a "high theological view of preaching since it emphasizes quite strongly the connection

---

28. Alex Kato, "The Theology Behind the Books We Choose." Paper presented at the Evangelical Homiletics Society Conference, 2017 in South Hamilton, Massachusetts. Haddon Robinson's *Biblical Preaching* ranked a close second to Long's, yet Kato acknowledges that the size of the survey sample leaves open the question of which book is actually the most widely used.

29. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching* 3rd ed. (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, 2016).

30. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 11-57.

31. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 50. Cf. also ix.

32. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 19.

33. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 20-30.

34. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 30-39.

35. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 39-50.

36. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 50.

37. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 25.

between preaching and the direct address of God."[38] The two key components of this view of preaching, asserts Long, are 1) communicating the message precisely while 2) delivering it plainly and clearly.[39] Taken alone, the herald image does not imply that the preacher should spend much time customizing the message for particular hearers; it is not the herald's responsibility to anticipate or expect particular results from the message being delivered.[40] The preacher's own personhood is not a central consideration in this view of preaching, for the message and its clear delivery does not depend upon, or alter according to, the uniqueness of the herald.[41] The preacher as herald, writes Long, speaks to the Church from God, and this renders a preacher's relationship to the congregation somewhat paradoxical; the preacher is "both insider and outsider."[42] However, this position does strengthen the preacher's ability to speak prophetically to situations and persons within the Church, announcing "the reign of God over the powers and principalities of the culture."[43]

Preacher as Pastor

Reflecting on the image of *the preacher as pastor*,[44] Long observes that, in contrast to the herald image, the pastor image more clearly assumes that there is healing power in the gospel, and that this power works in the inner lives of listeners as the sermon is delivered. Per this image, there is a practical, personal result to preaching. The preacher as pastor approaches the Bible to bring a better life to individuals in the congregation; preaching is therapeutic in intent. "The herald has one job, remaining faithful to the message, but the pastoral preacher must think about what parts of that message hearers need at this moment and what

38. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 20.
39. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 22.
40. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 22f.
41. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 23.
42. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 23.
43. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 25.
44. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 30-39.

aspects of the gospel they can receive amid the pain and clutter of their lives."[45] Long notes the ministry of Harry Fosdick, who moved many preachers "to refashion the sermon in the image of the counseling session."[46]

This image for the preacher implies the preacher to possess significant personal virtues and professional skills in order to "do the therapeutic pastoral task."[47] It thus engenders a particular stance towards the interpretation of Scripture, a stance which emphasizes "aspects of texts that involve personal issues and healing possibilities."[48] It encourages the preacher to consider how to present, through chosen language and structures, the sermon so as to reach the desired therapeutic goal(s) consistent with "the gospel."[49]

Preacher as Storyteller/Poet

Long's discussion of his third "master metaphor" of preaching, *the preacher as storyteller*, notes the enduring significance of storytelling and artistic expression in Scripture and Christian preaching. "If the herald image emphasizes the sermon's fidelity, and the pastor image emphasizes its therapeutic value, then the storyteller/poet image emphasizes the rhetorical beauty and artfulness of the sermon."[50] For the storytelling preacher, the delivery and form of the sermon are as important as the content of the message. While seeking to create sermons of beauty and artfulness, storyteller preachers "pay just as much attention to the Scripture as the herald preachers do – perhaps even more since they take the specific literary character of the Bible into account."[51] Further, the storyteller

---

45. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 31.

46. E. Brooks Holifield, *A History of Pastoral Care in America: From Salvation to Self-Realization* (Nashville, Tennessee: Abingdon, 1983) 220, quoted in Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 32f.

47. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 33.

48. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 34.

49. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 34.

50. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 40.

51. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 43.

preacher must consider the inner lives of the hearers, similar to the pastoral preacher.[52]

Preacher as Witness

After examining these three metaphors for the preacher, Long proposes that the image of *the preacher as witness*, "is more suited than any of the others to disclose the true character of Christian preaching. Indeed, this image gathers up the virtues of the others and holds their strongest traits in creative tension."[53] He notes that the term "witness" is used in Scripture, both in the Old and New Testaments,[54] and then moves to an essay by Paul Ricoeur which discusses Isaiah 43's mentioning of "witness."[55] Long concludes that the term "is a legal term; a witness appears in the courtroom as part of a trial…it is precisely the law court origin of the witness metaphor that gives it power as an image for the preacher."[56] He continues:

> The court has access to the truth only through the witness. It seeks the truth, but it must look for it in testimony of the witness. The very life of the witness, then, is bound up into the testimony. The witness cannot claim to be removed, objectively pointing to the evidence. What the witness believes to be true is a part of the evidence, and when the truth told by the witness is despised by the people, the witness may suffer, or even be killed, as a result of the testimony.[57]

Thus, per Long, the image of the *preacher as witness* discloses Christian preaching's "true character."[58] In the subsequent discussion, Long enumerates and explains six implications of this understanding of *the preacher as witness*: 1) The preacher as witness has an authority which does not come from "rank or power but rather because of what the preacher has seen and heard."[59] 2) The

---

52. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 43.
53. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 49f.
54. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 50.
55. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 50f.
56. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 51.
57. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 52.
58. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 49f.
59. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 52.

preacher as witness "testifies [to] the encounter between God and ourselves," of which hearing Scripture is a central component.[60] 3) The *preacher as witness* conveys a message which "seeks its own verbal form, and the responsibility of the witness is to allow that form to emerge."[61] 4) The *preacher as witness* does not convey an entirely objective message, because he has witnessed an encounter, and "where one stands influences what one sees."[62] 5) The *preacher as witness* role emerges particularly within corporate Christian worship, which is itself the "dramatic reenactment of a great and cosmic trial in which the justice of God is poised against all the powers that spoil creation and enslave human life. In this trial Christ is the one true faithful witness." The preacher's sermon is part of the witness of Jesus. 6) Finally, *the preacher as witness* image is open to acknowledging "those who have stood outside the official structures of authority to proclaim their experience of the gospel."[63]

The widespread use of Long's book by seminary preaching professors over the last twenty-five years demonstrates that many view Long's work positively.[64] In particular, Long's discussion of homiletical images is clear and helpful. Long proceeds with an awareness of the contemporary homiletical discussion, and brings his practically-oriented reflection into dialogue with significant homiletical streams of reflection. For example, Long engages Karl Barth's image for the preacher – *the preacher as herald*[65] – yet also offers a counterpoint by Karl Rahner.[66]

One characteristic of Long's work, and one that might account for its longtime appeal among North American homiletics texts, is that it does not

---

60. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 53.

61. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 54.

62. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 55.

63. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 56.

64. C.J. Childs and Nancy L. deClaissé-Walford, review of *The Witness of Preaching* 3rd ed., by Thomas G. Long, *Review & Expositor* 115.1 (February 2018): 139f.

65. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 20. He cites Karl Barth, *The Doctrine of the Word of God*, *Church Dogmatics* I/1, trans G.T. Thomson (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1936) 57.

66. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 27.

forward only one way of optimally building a sermon. He discusses this in the preface to the third edition.[67] "The new thing was to create a homiletics textbook that was in direct conversation with other voices and opinions in the field of preaching."[68] The majority of homiletical texts prior to this "said, in effect, 'Here is how I do it. Imitate me.'"[69] Yet beginning with the first edition of *The Witness of Preaching*, and more so in the 2016 third edition, Long's reflection on Christian preaching embraced the plurality of theology and method which has marked recent North American homiletical discussions; he did not simply state the best way to build a sermon, but suggested rhetorical options based on his theological consideration of Christian preaching. In this, Long's work functions like a tour guide at points, journeying through and weighing the rhetorical options open to preachers without prescribing only one.[70]

In other words, to return to Chapter 1's noting that rhetorical modes of reflection on preaching can intermingle with theological modes of reflection, Long's *The Witness of Preaching* does not proceed in a strictly rhetorical mode. The entire book could be understood as an ongoing process of reflection on what Christian preaching is – finding the preacher in view of the Christian God and within an ordered creation. This theological mode of reflection allows Long's homiletic to remain coherent while guiding readers through a variety of homiletical theories and resultant rhetorical options.

Yet this theological reflection remains focused and coordinated, in large part because Long's discussion is interested in describing Christian preaching by choosing a helpful, comprehensive central image. "I have tried to allow the theological image of bearing witness to the gospel to govern and organize every aspect of the process of creating a sermon from beginning to end."[71] Long's

---

67. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, ix-xii.
68. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, ix.
69. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, x.
70. E.g. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 155-170.
71. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, ix.

discussion is not aimed, as, for example, Jason Meyer's was, at collecting insights from Scripture for an understanding of preaching, nor at simply gathering systematic theological insights about preaching in order to reflect on contemporary preaching. Long's work aims at capturing a general understanding of preaching, gleaned from portions of Scripture, existing homiletical literature, and the Christian practice of preaching itself. He labels this captured understanding of preaching "the preacher as witness." Said differently, this homiletic consciously chooses a trope, a central image around which the reflection grows.

In his introduction to *Slow of Speech and Unclean Lips: Contemporary Images of Preaching Identity*, Robert Reid offers several helpful observations about the role and importance of these kinds of images in homiletical reflection. Briefly examining Reid's work at this point will assist in highlighting the differences between Long's homiletical reflection and the viceregal homiletic.

According to Reid, "a trope of thought…functions as a way of thinking and reasoning drawn from one domain of knowledge and applied to arrive at understanding of another domain."[72] When this literary device is in play, the preacher or the act of preaching is considered in light of the trope, or image. For example, the first essay in Reid's volume is "The Preacher as Messenger of Hope," and considers the preacher as a messenger who brings the hope of the gospel.[73]

Reid's conversation surfaces the key insight that tropes can deeply influence homiletical reflection. He observes:

> [A] trope of thought can entail whole ways of knowing and assumptions that may be otherwise unexamined…Eventually a simple trope may

---

72. Robert S. Reid, ed., *Slow of Speech and Unclean Lips: Contemporary Images of Preaching Identity* (Eugene, Oregon: Cascade, 2010) 6. Reid notes the work of Kenneth Burke, *Grammar of Motives* (Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 2009) 503-517, wherein Burke posits his four master tropes: metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and irony.

73. James F. Kay, "Preacher as Messenger of Hope," in *Slow of Speech and Unclean Lips*, Robert S. Reid, ed., 13-34.

> become a comprehensive trope of thought. Much more than a turn of speech or an embellishment that adds insight, a trope of thought can control an entire orientation to a way of knowing and understanding.[74]

A trope, according to what Reid writes here, may exercise remarkable influence; more than operating merely as something to which the preacher is compared, the trope itself "can control an entire orientation to a way of…understanding."[75]

The research of literary and communication critics confirm Reid's insight; any trope intends to invent a new perspective.[76] This means that, inasmuch as two homiletical tropes differ, the perspectives they offer on preaching differ as well. The essays from various homileticians which fill the remainder of Reid's *Slow of Speech and Unclean Lips* show how different homiletical tropes produce different perspectives on preaching, and therefore different homiletical reflection. Further, a glance at the range of contemporary homiletical reflection reveals regular use of tropes; for example, homileticians have considered the preacher as a steward,[77] one who weeps,[78] a fool,[79] a postman,[80] one who amplifies God's whispers to a shout,[81] and one who brings the presence of God.[82] These discussions note how a preacher's task is like that of a steward's stewarding, the weeper's weeping, the fool's foolishness, and so forth. In short, the tropes themselves, to return to Reid's insight, represent varied created perspectives from which to view preaching.

---

74. Robert S. Reid, ed., *Slow of Speech and Unclean Lips*, 6, 8.

75. Robert S. Reid, ed., *Slow of Speech and Unclean Lips*, 8.

76. David Tell, "Burke's Encounter with Ransom: Rhetoric and Epistemology in 'Four Master Tropes,'" *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* (Fall 2004):[33-54] 37.

77. John R.W. Stott, *The Preacher's Portrait* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961) 11-32.

78. Christine M. Smith, *Preaching as Weeping, Confession, and Resistance: Radical Responses to Radical Evil* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, 1992).

79. Charles L. Campbell, "Preacher as Ridiculous Person," in *Slow of Speech and Unclean Lips*, Robert S. Reid, ed., 89-108.

80. Karl Barth, *Church Dogmatics*, I/2, 862.

81. Marjorie H. Suchocki, *The Whispered Word* (St. Louis, Missouri: Chalice, 1999) 21.

82. Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Finkenwalde Lectures on Homiletics*, in Clyde E. Fant, *Bonhoeffer: Worldly Preaching* (Nashville, Tennessee: Thomas Nelson, 1975) 133.

In Contrast: the Viceregal Homiletic

Reid's assertion about homiletical images reveals a key similarity between Long's work and the viceregal homiletic. Long's *preacher as witness* image governs and organizes every aspect of his homiletic. He claims that this was his intent in structuring the book,[83] and the image does recur throughout the book.[84] Likewise, the viceregal homiletic's trope of *the preacher as Christian viceregent* orders the entirety of the viceregal homiletic's reflection.

Yet this similarity reaches further than each homiletic simply having an explicit central image. The discussions that produce the central image of both Long's homiletic and the viceregal homiletic are theological in mode, not rhetorical; that is, they have as their object a description of Christian preaching in relation to God and God's world. In a basic sense, noted Chapter 1, theological reflection on Christian preaching involves, first, viewing the preacher and Christian preaching in light of the Christian God. Second, this kind of reflection engenders a philosophical view of Christian preaching, a view that locates Christian preaching and its constituent parts "in the universal system, understanding their respective values, and determining their mutual dependence."[85] Both the viceregal homiletic and Long's discussion inquire into what their chosen image says Christian preaching is and how that image relates Christian preaching to other things. Ultimately each chooses, per their own way, an image which orders the act of Christian preaching in itself and in relation to the rest of creation. Long's resulting rhetorical discussions emanate from this prior theological mode discussion, which aligns *the preacher as witness* with the Christian God.

A new insight has emerged at this point: choosing an image for the preacher involves the theological mode of reflection on Christian preaching, for it

---

83. Thomas G Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, ix.

84. E.g. Thomas G Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 58, 77 (implied), 113, 172, 195, 270, 286.

85. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, ed. Frank M. Turner (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University, 1996) 99.

involves locating specifically Christian preaching within the creation. Such a choice inherently consigns values to different constituent parts of Christian preaching while also interrelating them with one another and the rest of creation.

Per Reid,[86] a trope works by drawing a "way of thinking and reasoning" from one discipline, or "domain of knowledge," into another discipline in order to "arrive at understanding." When Long considers what image best "discloses the true character of Christian preaching,"[87] including the three master metaphors he identifies which inform his *witness* image,[88] he is considering what "way of thinking and reasoning" to draw from what "domain of knowledge" in order to "arrive at" a viewpoint which, in his words, "discloses…Christian preaching."[89] The choice, and the discussion which describes it, is neither incidental nor accidental to Long's homiletical reflection; it centers and organizes it.

This insight concomitantly throws additional light on the importance of Chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis: those chapters demonstrate the process by which the viceregal homiletic obtains its central image (Chapter 3), and clearly trace out the specific point from which the viceregal homiletic's perspective on Christian preaching emanates (Chapter 4), such that the perspective on Christian preaching created by the image, and therefore the homiletical reflection produced by the viceregal homiletic, is controlled and bounded by Beale's particular understanding of the Christian God's creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Christ.

In the case of Long's homiletic, he claims that the *witness* image comes from the legal world.[90] Yet this "legal" sense seems to find ultimate root in the Christian understanding of a great cosmic trial of good versus evil. Long writes

---

86. Robert S. Reid, ed., *Slow of Speech and Unclean Lips*, 6.
87. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 49.
88. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 19-57.
89. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 49.
90. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 51.

that the preacher's *witness* role emerges particularly within corporate Christian worship, the "dramatic reenactment of a great and cosmic trial in which the justice of God is poised against all the powers that spoil creation and enslave human life. In this trial Christ is the one true faithful witness."[91] When Long states that preachers are witnesses, then, it is with this explicitly Christian theological background in view.

Though Long could have taken opportunity to develop this further, his statement that preachers witness within the faithful and true witness, Jesus Christ, reveals that Long's understanding of the preacher takes form in light of the Christian God of Christian Scripture. Further, it reveals that Long's homiletic allocates for the humanity of the preacher; it does not merely see preaching as a function, because "[t]he very life of the witness…is bound up into the testimony."[92] Here we see that Long's homiletic more clearly accounts for the humanity of the preacher affecting the preaching of the preacher than did Meyer's.

Thus, both the viceregal homiletic and Long's homiletic consider the source and quality of the "way of thinking and reasoning" that they draw into homiletical reflection. Each chooses a central trope from a domain of knowledge that it has found suitable to inform its homiletic. The domain of knowledge from which the viceregal homiletic draws its central way of reasoning is Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency. Our discussion has suggested that, though Long states that his *preacher as witness* image is drawn from a legal context, his understanding of that context is fundamentally rooted in the Christian understanding of the Christian God. It more readily accounts for the preacher's humanity than did Meyer's homiletic.

Yet Long's homiletic is also different from the viceregal homiletic. Continuing our analysis of Long's central image, during his theological-mode

---

91. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 55.

92. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 52.

discussion introducing his image, Long describes three other images for the preacher – *herald, pastor, and storyteller/poet.*[93] The *preacher as witness* image, Long claims, takes up the strengths of each of these.[94] He does not specifically show this to be accurate, however, though moments in his discussion of the six implications of the *witness* image may, for the engaged reader, touch upon several of the issues he raises in his critiques of the *preacher as herald, pastor, and storyteller/poet* images.[95] Said differently, while it is clear that Long chooses his *witness* image over the others, it is unclear how exactly the *preacher as witness* image intersects with each of the other images.

The viceregal homiletic's central image more clearly incorporates and gives context for additional, subsidiary images within itself. The *preacher as a Christian viceregent* is the central image, while the other summative statements noted in Chapter 4 function as images subordinated to the first. These statements are as follows:

- The preacher is a sign of God's rule and presence.
- The preacher is a human who expands the reign of God.
- The preacher is a participant in Christ's viceregency.
- The preacher is an eschatological foretaste of humanity's glorification.

The viceregal homiletic then, like Long's homiletic, does choose one central image for the preacher rather than others. However, this choice clearly associates the viceregal homiletic's central image with these subsidiary images.

Two more comparisons will conclude our discussion of Long's homiletic: Long's *preacher as witness* image does honor the preacher's humanity and views the preacher in relation to Jesus – specifically, Jesus the true witness. On this point Long's homiletic implies, like the viceregal homiletic, that the act of Christian preaching bears an enduring relation to Christ's eschatological

---

93. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 25-48.
94. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 49f.
95. Thomas G. Long, *The Witness of Preaching*, 52-56.

judgment and the renewal of all things. Further, both Long's homiletic and the viceregal homiletic hold that, though preachers speak truly with their own voices, preachers nevertheless bring messages that originate outside themselves. Per Long, the preacher bears witness to an encounter outside himself; per the viceregal homiletic, the preacher's words image the prior words of God. Here, the point of differentiation between the *preacher as viceregent* and the *preacher as witness* seems to be in the viceregal homiletic's tracing out of why this can happen. The viceregal homiletic's predicating its understanding of the *preacher as viceregent* upon Beale's biblical-theological reflection allows the viceregal homiletic to incorporate more consistently this kind of reflection.

Finally, the viceregal homiletic is able to describe and incorporate the place of the congregation in the act of preaching in ways similar to Long. Long, building on Moltmann, states that the preacher is one that rises from the midst of the congregation. Noting this about the preacher grants Long's homiletic a more harmonious character than one that emphasized, for example, the herald image exclusively. A preacher who has risen from the congregation to bear witness is marked by that congregation's identity and language.

Though Long does not pursue this in his homiletic, this commonality between preacher and congregation lays the groundwork for, among other things, speech communication analyses of the act of Christian preaching which note that the preacher and congregation create meaning together.

The viceregal homiletic also lays this groundwork, though in a different fashion. Hearkening back to Adam's role in Eden, the viceregal homiletic holds that though Adam was made from the earth, he was not merely earth. Adam's kinship with the creation informed a key and ongoing part of his rule over it. Likewise, there is always a sense in which, then, the congregation represents the material, the earth, from which the preacher is drawn, and not only the preacher, but the preacher's earthed and contextualized manners of speech. Just as Eden was planted by God to be the place from which Adam was taken and over which

Adam would rule, the congregation is the result of God's direct creative and ordering action, and is the place from which the preacher is taken and over which the preacher expresses the viceregal rule of God. Just as Adam would not be Adam without Eden and the creation, the preacher would not be the preacher without the congregation and the world.

What emerges here per the viceregal homiletic is a picture of the Christian preacher not merely as over the congregation, but as one creature within the creation alongside other creatures. Thus, inasmuch as God's revelation comes to the congregation via the Christian preacher, the congregation is as integral to that event as the Christian preacher is.

Our discussion proceeds now to a popular and influential trope in contemporary North American homiletics, the image of the *preacher as bridge builder* offered by John Stott.

John Stott: Preacher as Bridge Builder

Like Thomas Long, John Stott has had notable influence upon North American homiletics. Numbered in 2005 by *Time* magazine as one of the most influential people in the world,[96] Stott's influence on North American evangelical Christianity extends through over 50 books. In homiletics particularly, his 1961 book *The Preacher's Portrait*[97] as well as his 1981 book, *Between Two Worlds*[98] have informed the homiletics of at least two generations of preachers. *Between Two*

---

96. Billy Graham, "John Stott," *Time*, April 18, 2005, accessed August 11, 2018, https://web.archive.org/web/20170302185311/http:/content.time.com/time/specials/packages/article/0,28804,1972656_1972717_1974108,00.html.

97. John R.W. Stott, *The Preacher's Portrait* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961) 9. *The Preacher's Portrait* consists of five chapters wherein Stott describes the preacher as a steward, herald, witness, father, and servant. Each chapter's image for the preacher governs the observations about preaching within that chapter. These are standard examples of simple images; no stacked, central image unifies and orders the five chapters of *A Preacher's Portrait*. As Chapter 2 noted, this kind of homiletical monograph offers no overarching, unified philosophy of Christian preaching, though it can, and does, produce helpful discrete insights about preaching by comparing contemporary preachers to Scriptural images.

98. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds: The Challenge of Preaching Today* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

Worlds ranked on a 2011 survey of North American teachers of preaching of the most influential preaching books of the past 25 years.[99] The longevity of Stott's influence, as well as the shape of his homiletical reflection, makes him a suitable conversation partner for this chapter's presentation of the viceregal homiletic. Because *Between Two Worlds* sums up and advances the homiletical discussion Stott began twenty years earlier in *The Preacher's Portrait*, our discussion here will engage *Between Two Worlds*.

Pertinent for the discussion at hand, *Between Two Worlds* presents the preacher using the image of a bridge builder. Stott begins his conversation of this image with the following:

> …I am going to develop a different metaphor to illustrate the essential nature of preaching. It is non-biblical in the sense that it is not explicitly used in Scripture, but I hope to show that what it lays upon us is a fundamentally biblical task. The metaphor is that of bridge-building. Now a bridge is a means of communication between two places which would otherwise be cut off from one another by a river or ravine. It makes possible a flow of traffic which without it would be impossible.[100]

Preachers are to build "means of communication between two places which would otherwise be cut off." The preacher "makes possible a flow of traffic which…would be impossible."

Stott continues, "[i]t is across [the] broad and deep divide of two thousand years of changing culture (more still in the case of the Old Testament) that Christian communicators have to throw bridges."[101] According to Stott, preachers are bridge builders between the world of the text and the world of today: he later describes this as a bridge "between divine revelation and human experience."[102]

---

99. Michael Duduit, "The 25 Most Influential Preaching Books Of The Last 25 Years."
100. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 137f.
101. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 138.
102. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 338.

Going back and forth across this bridge enables the preacher to "open up the biblical principles which relate to the problems of contemporary society, in such a way as to help everybody to develop a Christian judgment about them."[103] "It is [the preacher's] responsibility to teach [the congregation] with clarity and conviction the plain truths of Scripture, in order to help them develop a Christian mind, and to encourage them to think with it about the great problems of today, and so to grow into maturity in Christ."[104] The preacher as a bridge builder will develop this Christian mind: "not a mind which is thinking about specifically Christian or even religious topics, but a mind which is thinking about everything, however apparently 'secular,' and doing so 'Christianly' or within a Christian frame of reference."[105]

This central image emerges within a broad discussion of a variety of aspects of Christian preaching. Chapter 1 is a historical sketch of preaching in the Church, Chapter 2 outlines what Stott identifies as contemporary "objections" to preaching, Chapter 3 presents "theological foundations for preaching,"[106] and then Chapter 4 presents this central image. Chapter 5 outlines what Stott calls the preacher's "call to study;" Chapter 6 offers practical advice for preparing a sermon; Chapters 7 and 8 deal with four characteristics of the preacher Stott sees as necessary – sincerity, earnestness, courage, and humility.[107] Generally speaking, Stott asserts that Scriptural teaching must be contextualized in the areas of ethics, social and political issues, and areas of conflict if preaching is to grow Christians to maturity.[108] Stott accordingly exhorts the preacher to

103. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 167.
104. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 173.
105. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 170.
106. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 92-134.
107. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 262-337.
108. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 151-179.

study both the world of the Bible and the world of today;[109] neglecting either "makes bridge-building impossible and non-communication inevitable."[110]

There also seem to be three other, subsidiary, images operative in Stott's homiletic as well. First, within Chapter 5 Stott emphasizes how the preacher is to study – both the text and the contemporary world.[111] In this, two of these subsidiary images emerge: the preacher as exegete of Scripture, and the preacher as exegete of contemporary culture. Finally, based on the importance Stott places on preachers possessing certain virtues – sincerity, earnestness, courage, and humility, which he spends two chapters discussing[112] – it seems that a third implied subsidiary image for Stott's homiletic is the preacher as a mature Christian.

For Stott's homiletical reflection in *Between Two Worlds*, then, it seems that his central, controlling image is *the preacher as bridge builder*, and that three subsidiary images exist as well: *the preacher as exegete of culture*, *the preacher as exegete of Scripture*, and *the preacher as mature Christian*. The controlling image is clearly explicit, while the three subsidiary images are more implicit.

Stott's homiletical reflection throughout the book is rich with Scriptural insights,[113] anecdotes from great preachers,[114] and cultural analyses.[115] The enduring popularity of the book is a testimony to its grasp of enduring aspects of preaching.[116] Its inclusion of so much material from the history of preaching indicates that Stott's image of *preaching as bridge building* developed, like Long's

---

109. "The Call to Study." John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 180-210.

110. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 180.

111. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 181-201.

112. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 262-337.

113. E.g. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 16-18, 116-125.

114. E.g. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 15-49.

115. E.g. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 50-85.

116. Cf. Scott M. Gibson, "The Legacy of John Stott's *Between Two Worlds*," Eerdword: the Eerdmans blog, July 24, 2017, accessed August 11, 2018, http://eerdword.com/2017/07/24/the-legacy-of-john-stotts-between-two-worlds/.

preacher as witness image, in conjunction with a significant awareness of Christian practice and intellectual reflection. In addition, the fact that Stott wrote the book while serving in pastoral ministry indicates his grasp of the practical difficulties that preaching pastors encounter. These characteristics have and will likely continue to contribute to the book's enduring value and popularity among teachers and students of preaching in North America.

Stott's choice of the *preaching as bridge building* central image, however, raises some questions.

When Stott first introduces the preacher as a bridge builder,[117] his chapter surveys six images of the preacher – town crier, sower, ambassador, steward, shepherd, and workman.[118] These images, he writes, imply "the givenness of the message. Preachers are not to invent it; it has been entrusted to them."[119] To this point the discussion is clear and helpful, though without an overarching central image it remains simply a collection of loosely associated insights, similar to his prior book on preaching, *The Preacher's Portrait.*

At this point Stott asserts that these six images "make less clear" the need for the preacher to "contextualize the Word of God."[120] Stott then pivots to "a famous essay published in 1955," by "Lord Snow."[121]

Here it seems Stott is referring to Charles P. Snow's essay, "Two Cultures," published in *New Statesman* and later expanded and published as *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution.*[122] In these two works Snow noted a

---

117. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 136.

118. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 136.

119. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 136.

120. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 137.

121. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 137.

122. Snow first published "Two Cultures" in the 6 October 1956 edition of *New Statesman*. After presenting similar material in 1959 as part of his Rede Lecture at Cambridge University, Snow expanded it into *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University, 1959).

"gulf of mutual incomprehension" between the arts and sciences.[123] Snow criticized the British educational system for emphasizing the humanities over the sciences.[124] In a later, expanded edition of the same book, Snow would offer a more optimistic outlook concerning the two cultures developing mutual understanding: a potential "third culture" which incorporated the capacities of both.[125]

Yet Stott does not note any of this as he introduces his bridge builder image, and it is unclear to what extent he expects his readers to be aware of Snow's work. After mentioning Snow's work, he simply asserts:

> But…the gulf between both of them [that is, the competing cultures of art and science] and the ancient world is wider still. It is across the broad and deep divide of two thousand years of changing culture (more still in the case of the Old Testament) that Christian communicators have to throw bridges. Our task is to enable God's revealed truth to flow out of the Scriptures into the lives of men and women today.[126]

---

123. The section of Snow's work from which Stott draws seems to be:

> A good many times I have been present at gatherings of people who, by the standards of the traditional culture, are thought highly educated and who have with considerable gusto been expressing their incredulity at the illiteracy of scientists. Once or twice I have been provoked and have asked the company how many of them could describe the Second Law of Thermodynamics. The response was cold: it was also negative. Yet I was asking something which is the scientific equivalent of: Have you read a work of Shakespeare's?
>
> I now believe that if I had asked an even simpler question — such as, What do you mean by mass, or acceleration, which is the scientific equivalent of saying, Can you read? — not more than one in ten of the highly educated would have felt that I was speaking the same language. So the great edifice of modern physics goes up, and the majority of the cleverest people in the western world have about as much insight into it as their neolithic ancestors would have had.

These paragraphs describe the gulf Snow observed between two bodies of knowledge, the arts and the sciences, within twentieth century British culture. Snow's general observations here grew into an assertion that this gulf had curtailed western civilization's ability to address societal issues. Charles P. Snow, *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*, 3.

124. This, according to Snow, was a mistake given the indispensability of scientists in the Second World War. Charles P. Snow, *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*, 3.

125. Charles P. Snow, *The Two Cultures: And a Second Look; an Expanded Version of the Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1969).

126. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 138.

According to Stott, preachers bridge a gulf. Notable here is that, in the first sentence just cited, the bridge spans from Snow's competing cultures of today back through linear history to the ancient world. That is, the bridge goes from the thought world of today to, assumedly, the thought world of the ancient world – an instrument, as it were, of ideological time travel. This seems to be confirmed by the next sentence, which says that the "divide" consists of "two thousand years of changing culture," as well as Stott's prior explanation on the same page that "the chasm is a deep rift between the biblical world and the modern world."[127] In short, for Stott the preacher's goal is "to enable God's revealed truth to flow out of the Scriptures into the lives of men and women today."[128] Yet Stott's subsequent discussion throughout *Between Two Worlds* fails to describe clearly and consistently the bridge. Stott simply does not specify what two points, exactly, the preacher bridges in the act of preaching. At different points in the book, Stott describes at least six pairs of things bridged by preachers. He writes that the bridge connects "the Biblical world" and "the modern world,"[129] "the ancient world" and "today,"[130] the "given message" to the "existential situation,"[131] "Christ" to "individuals,"[132] the "Word of God" to the "world,"[133] and "divine revelation" to "human experience."[134] The following chart shows these six pairs in two columns, the first term of each pair in column A, and the second in column B:

127. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 138.
128. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 138.
129. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 138.
130. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 138.
131. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 137.
132. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 155.
133. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 338.
134. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 338.

A	B
Biblical world	modern world
ancient world	today
given message	existential situation
Christ	individuals
Word of God	world
divine revelation	human experience

A cursory glance at this chart reveals that the terms in column A do not all mean the same thing; neither do all the terms in column B. For the critical reader, and particularly the reader cognizant of traditional understandings of Christian theological terminology, Stott's bridge is lost in a fog. If the bridge spans from point A to point B, where is each point?

This gentle unclarity, logical and theological, suffuses the book. On simply a logical level, the fact that Stott's multiple pairs of terms do not all mean the same thing raises questions regarding the internal consistency of Stott's reflection. Further, the fact that Stott must jump between multiple terms, naming, as it were, multiple bridges between multiple pairs of points, perhaps indicates that the act of preaching is too complex a phenomenon to be described comprehensively by the image of a single bridge.

Stott's logical unclarity is unfortunately exacerbated by his nonspecific use of theological language. For example, Stott writes that preaching creates bridges "between the Word and the world, between divine revelation and human experience."[135] The first phrase indicates that preachers build bridges "between the Word and the world," yet the English theological term "Word" has several possible definitions. In the rest of the book, Stott uses the moniker "the Word of

135. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 338.

God," to indicate both the Incarnate Word[136] and the words of the Bible.[137] Yet this is, again, nonspecific and unclear, for referring to Christ as the Incarnate Word invokes the concept of the preexistent Logos through which "all things were made" (John 1:3). Thus, at least three aspects of the term "Word" come into view in this one description of the bridge's beginning: 1) the words of Scripture, 2) Jesus the Word Incarnate, or 3) the Word which is the uncreated rationality of God – the pre-incarnate second person of the Trinity. Though all three definitions can be found within the realm of historic Christian orthodoxy, they are nevertheless different concepts, and therefore indicate different points at which the bridge might begin. The intent of Stott's phrase seems to be to use theological language somewhat poetically to refer to how preachers function. Yet without specifically aligning his reflection with the broader fabric from which the theological term is lifted, the result is a profoundly deficient theological statement. At best, saying that preaching creates a bridge "between the Word and the world"[138] is a clumsily phrased affirmation that preachers speak God's words to people. At worst, it is a tacit denial that the Word already permeates the world, and has already become flesh and inaugurated the redemption of all things.[139] This is logical and theological incoherence.

It is clear that Stott had no intention of diverging from historic Christian orthodoxy; he authored several classic books, perhaps most notably *The Cross of Christ*, which clearly lays out the biblical foundation for, among other things, an

---

136. E.g. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 15, 150.

137. E.g. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 96-103, esp. 96f, where Stott asserts that "'God's Word written' is an excellent definition of Scripture," but immediately must qualify this statement with a discussion of human agency and the inspiration of Scripture. Without disagreeing with the substance of Stott's reflection here, one might wonder whether "God's Word written" is truly the best way of defining Scripture if it must immediately be qualified by more definitions.

138. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 338.

139. Further, "the Word of God," whether written, Incarnate, or pre-Incarnate Logos, is not synonymous with the "ancient world," or the "Biblical world" either, two other possibilities in column A for the beginning point of the preacher's bridge.

orthodox, evangelical Christology.[140] Yet while acknowledging these other achievements, it remains that *Between Two Worlds* contains some statements which lack theological precision and consistency. This is surprising for a book intended for Christian leaders and seminary students. Also, to return to our homiletical discussion, this lack of precision blurs what point exactly Stott intends his bridge to begin on, and skews Stott's exact portrayal of what a preacher is.

The sixth pair of terms noted on the chart, "between divine revelation and human experience," has a similar blurring effect, for both "revelation" and "human experience" have a spectrum of possible meanings when considered critically. For example, 20th century theological methods have utilized human experience as a source for theology more readily than had earlier eras of the Church.[141] Because Stott has regularly mentioned cultural currents of 1981 it seems that by referring to "human experience" he means that the preacher explains the teaching of Scripture in a way that appeals to and is understood by contemporary hearers. Yet "between divine revelation and human experience" could easily be interpreted in a wide variety of ways.

Similar critiques could be put forward for nearly all of the pairs, noted in the above chart, which Stott chooses to describe the location of the bridge. Using theological terminology to describe the bridge is not objectionable; on the contrary, it is a step in the right direction provided Chapter 1 of this thesis is accurate. Yet if homiletics is to describe Christian preaching in ways that interface and dialogue with the Christian theological tradition, homileticians must seek to grasp and use theological language in ways more explicitly congruent with the ideological shape and specificity of that tradition.

---

140. Cf., for example, Stott's *The Cross of Christ* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity, 1986), which has become, in David Wells's words, "a classic which is profound in a way that few evangelical books have been in recent years. It is compelling in its simplicity and comprehensive in its grasp..." David F. Wells, "Endorsement of the Twentieth Anniversary Edition of John Stott's *The Cross of Christ*," accessed August 21, 2018, https://www.ivpress.com/the-cross-of-christ.

141. Cf. Alister E. McGrath, *Christian Theology: An Introduction* 3rd edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 2001) 226-234.

Our discussion has been examining the quality of John Stott's image of the *preacher as bridge builder* as presented in *Between Two Worlds*, and has noted that Stott's initial derivation of the image from Charles Snow's work may not have grappled fully with Snow's original intent. Further, because Stott uses a variety of terms to describe where the bridge begins and ends, Stott's *preacher as bridge builder* image seems to suffer from logical inconsistency. Our discussion has suggested that the act of Christian preaching is too complex a phenomenon to be described completely by a single bridge. Finally, Stott's descriptions of the bridge are open to the charge of being logically and theologically unspecific.

Our discussion so far seems to indicate that Stott's homiletical reflection is evocative of what Chapter 1 observed regarding North American homiletics' general neglect of theological clarity and specificity. While it is clear that Stott had no intention of departing from historic Christian orthodoxy, it also seems that his project of describing how preaching must "contextualize the Word of God"[142] does not grapple fully with the specifics of the undeniably Christian theological language he chooses.[143]

Yet perhaps another question will bring more focus here: how does Stott's homiletic understand Christian preaching to have a distinctly Christian character? Inasmuch as it does proceed in a theological mode of reflection, how does *Between Two Worlds*, and in particular the central image of *the preacher as bridge builder*, differentiate Christian preaching from other instances of public speaking? Per this image, how is preaching Christian?

Stott begins *Between Two Worlds* with a statement pertinent to this question:

> Preaching is indispensable to Christianity. Without preaching a necessary part of its authenticity has been lost. For Christianity is, in its very

142. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 137.

143. Though it would be an overstatement to say that Stott makes theology a variable and rhetoric a constant, Stott's reflection has opportunity to make theology less variable, and more constant.

> essence, a religion of the Word of God. No attempt to understand Christianity can succeed which overlooks or denies the truth that the living God has taken the initiative to reveal himself savingly to fallen humanity; or that his self-revelation has been given by the most straightforward means of communication known to us, namely by a word and words; or that he calls upon those who have heard his Word to speak it to others.[144]

Though these sentences come at the beginning of his historical survey of preaching and therefore function as an initial summary of that chapter, they also shed light on some of what Stott sees as uniquely Christian about preaching. Based on this opening paragraph, it seems that Stott sees Christian preaching as generally evocative of a God who "has taken the initiative to reveal himself…by word and words," and who "calls upon those who have heard his Word to speak it to others."[145] Preaching is consistent with the actions of the God of the Bible, as well as a consistent response of those who have "heard his Word."

Stott's later chapter on the theological foundations of preaching[146] grants further insight on this question. He writes that "behind the concept and the act of preaching there lies a doctrine of God, a conviction about his being, his action and his purpose."[147] Further, "our doctrine of God leads naturally and inevitably to our doctrine of Scripture,"[148] and finally that "all true Christian preaching is expository preaching."[149] For Stott, then, expository preaching is the natural result and culmination of how the Christian God reveals himself.

With this general backdrop, some specific insights of how Stott understands preaching to be Christian become more clear. First, and most importantly, Stott understands preaching to be Christian because of the divine origin of the content preached. While preaching for Stott, as we will note in a

---

144. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 15.

145. Once again, Stott's gentle logical and theological unclarity is evident in his choice of the terms "word," "words," and "Word."

146. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 92-133.

147. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 93.

148. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 96.

149. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 125.

moment, includes communication, it is defined by Stott as the communication of the message given by God and recorded in Scripture. Stott's reflection here indicates that the uniqueness of preaching is found in the message itself: its divine origin, its truth, its inalterability. Here Stott's reflection seems similar to Long's description of the *preacher as herald* image.

This emphasis on the message of preaching leads to the second specific insight about how Stott understands preaching to be Christian. Because of the unique character of the message, how the preacher passes the message on is particularly important. The preacher in receipt of this divine message is at least obligated, and at most commanded, to pass the message on without alteration. Here is where the bulk of Stott's homiletical reflection is deployed: in, for example, describing the steward's obligations to pass on the message without alteration,[150] to consider both the Scripture and the contemporary culture,[151] to exposit rather than twisting verses or focusing on subtleties,[152] to tend to his own virtue,[153] to understand and exert his pastoral authority,[154] to be mindful of preaching's importance,[155] to listen to contemporary people,[156] and the list goes on.

The key here, and what makes preaching different than an act of public speaking, is both the nature of the message that is proclaimed and whatever concomitant, additional efforts of the preacher make his communication suit that message. In short, for Stott the unique Christian character of preaching resides in the preacher's proper delivery of the divine message. These two facets are both essential for Stott. On the one hand, without the divine message, preaching is not Christian. On the other hand, without proper delivery, the message itself is

---

150. E.g. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 136.
151. E.g. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 137-141.
152. E.g. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 225-227.
153. E.g. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 262-335.
154. E.g. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 58.
155. E.g. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 92-133, esp. 125-133.
156. E.g. John R.W. Stott, *Between Two Worlds*, 190-200.

at least misrepresented and could be lost altogether; thus absent proper delivery there also is no Christian preaching.

Here is where Stott's chosen image of the *preacher as bridge builder* can, perhaps, be most clearly appreciated. Per Stott, bridge building is the way to deliver the divine message properly; it is the way that honors the timeless message in Scripture while also truly bringing the message to the contemporary audience. Perhaps, the questions regarding its central image notwithstanding, Stott's *Between Two Worlds* speaks a twofold idea: Scripture is relevant for the world today, and good preaching thus requires a preacher of Christian maturity working hard to make clear this relevance.

In conclusion, John Stott's *preacher as bridge builder* image engages theological concepts though at times without reckoning fully with the context from which those concepts spring. This lexical inconsistency affects how Stott's central image is communicated, rendering its exact meaning somewhat uncertain. The unique Christian character of preaching, per Stott's homiletic, lies in the importance of the message preached, and the preacher's intentional and faithful communication of that message. Per Stott's homiletic, Scripture is relevant for the world today, and good preaching thus requires a preacher of Christian maturity working hard to make clear its relevance.

The fact that North American homiletics has used Stott's work so much may be related to these emphases. Stott's work is a staple for many evangelical seminaries in North America,[157] and homileticians have rightly highlighted the practical benefits of using Stott's *Between Two Worlds* in seminary preaching classes.[158] Perhaps Stott's work has long been a friend to North American evangelical homileticians not because it aims to provide a comprehensive theological picture of Christian preaching, but because it well introduces the

157. Alex Kato, "The Theology Behind the Books We Choose." Paper presented at the Evangelical Homiletics Society Conference, 2017 in South Hamilton, Massachusetts.

158. Scott M. Gibson, "The Legacy of John Stott's *Between Two Worlds*."

project of preaching for an era when Scripture's relevance is downplayed and preachers, ostensibly, do not do the hard work of making clear this relevance. Yet it seems necessary to question Stott's assertion that preaching is essentially an act of bridge building. Rather, it seems that preaching regularly functions as an act of bridge building and that this function is seen as particularly important by North American homileticians.

In Contrast: the Viceregal Homiletic

The viceregal homiletic provides a clear and stable central image that is able to unify and organize its homiletical reflection while also touching the essence of the act of Christian preaching.

The central image of the viceregal homiletic is the preacher as a Christian viceregent. The four other summative statements represent subsidiary governing images. As Chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis demonstrated, all of these images are the result of a comprehensive, theologically attuned, biblical-theological reading of Scripture, akin to Brevard Childs's Christological rereading of the canon, emerging from Beale's biblical-theological method and understanding of Christian viceregency. This differentiates the viceregal homiletic's images from other central images which proceed from the homiletician's assertion.

Further however, the viceregal homiletic's summative statements describe all acts and aspects of Christian preaching: past, present, and future. Unlike Stott's bridge having to move and change to describe some acts and aspects of Christian preaching, the viceregal homiletic can give account for any act or aspect of Christian preaching without having to reposition or reinterpret itself. This ability is related to what was mentioned in Chapter 3, that the category *Christian viceregent* is ideologically broader than the category *Christian preacher*. Because of this, rather than piecing together disparate insights about what Christian preaching is like, the viceregal homiletic begins from an image that is ideologically broader than the image "preacher" so that it can incorporate all instances and aspects of Christian preaching. In this way, the viceregal homiletic

can locate the essence of Christian preaching in proximity to other phenomena in the Christian God's creation.

The viceregal homiletic notes that the preacher is inherently suited to represent and speak for the Christian God within creation because he is created and renewed in the image of God in Jesus Christ. An act of Christian preaching wherein the meaning of a Scripture is unfolded consists simply of the preacher, who lives and therefore represents God in the contemporary world, voicing the meaning of Scripture to the congregation using his own words; it is the preacher's conscious, public attempt to bring his own speech into congruence with the speech of God, to the end that the speech of God might be contemporarily articulated, heard, and obeyed, and the creation be filled and subdued, to the end that God might be all and in all.

Conclusion

This chapter's discussion has contrasted three existing homiletics, Jason Meyer's *Preaching: A Biblical Theology*, Thomas Long's *The Witness of Preaching*, and John Stott's *Between Two Worlds*, with the viceregal homiletic in order to demonstrate that the viceregal homiletic is a new and distinct model for homiletical reflection. The chapter extended the argument of the prior four chapters because it considers the preacher as a Christian viceregent, following Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency. Our discussion has suggested that Meyer's reflection does not exhibit the progression of stewarding and heralding through different eras of redemptive history as clearly as it could. Further, while Meyer rightly expanded his scope of inquiry to arrive at what he calls a biblical theology of the ministry of the word, our discussion noted that the viceregal homiletic pursues its biblical theology of Christian preaching by establishing a biblical theology of humanity in Christ, in which it locates Christian preaching. This, our discussion suggested, allows the viceregal homiletic to more clearly and consistently reflect on how the function of, to use Meyer's phrase, "heralding and stewarding" interconnects with the humanity of the preacher.

Regarding Thomas Long's homiletic, our discussion showed that both the viceregal homiletic and Long's homiletic consider the source and quality of the "way of thinking and reasoning" that they draw into homiletical reflection. Each chooses a central image from a domain of knowledge that it has found suitable to inform its homiletic. The domain of knowledge from which the viceregal homiletic draws its central way of reasoning is Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency. Though Long states that his *preacher as witness* image is drawn from a legal context, his understanding of that context is fundamentally rooted in the Christian understanding of the Christian God.

Long's homiletic differed from the viceregal homiletic in the choice of its central image, as well as in the fact that the viceregal homiletic's central image more clearly incorporates and gives context for additional, subsidiary images within itself. In addition, our discussion suggested that the viceregal homiletic more readily gives an explanation as to why the preacher is able to speak words not his own, that is, words from God to the creation.

Our discussion showed that John Stott's *preacher as bridge builder* image engages theological concepts though at times without reckoning fully with the context from which those concepts spring. This lexical inconsistency affects how Stott's central image is communicated, rendering its exact meaning somewhat uncertain. The unique Christian character of preaching, per Stott's homiletic, lies in the importance of the message preached, and the preacher's intentional and faithful communication of that message. Per Stott's homiletic, Scripture is relevant for the world today, and good Christian preaching thus requires a preacher of Christian maturity working hard to make clear its relevance.

In contrast to Stott's homiletic, the viceregal homiletic provides a clear and stable central image that is able to unify and organize its homiletical reflection: the preacher as a Christian viceregent. As Chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis demonstrated, all of these images are the result of a comprehensive, theologically attuned, biblical-theological reading of Scripture, akin to Brevard

Childs's Christological rereading of the canon, emerging from Beale's biblical-theological method and understanding of Christian viceregency. This differentiates the viceregal homiletic's images from other central images which draw from a single passage or concept found in Scripture, or proceed from the homiletician's assertion.

The viceregal homiletic considers the preacher as a Christian viceregent, following Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency. The *preacher as a Christian viceregent* is the central image of the viceregal homiletic, while the other summative statements noted in Chapter 4 function as images subordinated to the first:

- The preacher is a sign of God's rule and presence.
- The preacher is a human who expands the reign of God.
- The preacher is a participant in Christ's viceregency.
- The preacher is an eschatological foretaste of humanity's glorification.

The five homiletical foci of the viceregal homiletic, which our chapter also mentioned, are as follows:

A) Preaching is a Christian practice.

B) Christian preaching is grounded in the person and work of Jesus.

C) Preaching is a human act; the preacher images God on earth, and Christian preaching expands the kingdom of God in creation.

D) The authority of the preacher's speech derives from the viceregal authority of Jesus.

E) Preaching is part of God's eschatological project of bringing all things in submission to Christ, and is a foretaste of fallen humanity and its speech being brought into that submission.

The viceregal homiletic, then, portrays Christian preaching to be a Christian practice whose identity and shape is rooted in the Christian God's creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Jesus Christ. It states that Christian preaching today, or in any era of history, is like Adam's rule in Eden, and that the speech of the preacher participates in Christ's viceregal

authority, an authority which is now truly manifest in creation, but which will be perfected at the Last Day.

This final chapter has offered this account of the viceregal homiletic's theological vision of Christian preaching as it places the viceregal homiletic in dialogue with three existing homiletics: those of Jason Meyer, Thomas Long, and John Stott. The three sections of this chapter engaged Meyer, Long, and Stott, and differentiated how the viceregal homiletic's vision of Christian preaching fits into God's creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Jesus Christ. This account has completed the discussions of the four prior chapters of this thesis, and has shown that the viceregal homiletic is a fresh and distinct homiletical model.

CONCLUSION

This thesis has traced out the viceregal homiletic's distinctiveness by showing how the viceregal homiletic differs from the general trends of contemporary homiletical reflection in North America, by investigating the method and content of what the viceregal homiletic draws from Gregory Beale, by showing how the viceregal homiletic develops Beale's viceregency into a fresh understanding of preaching, and finally, by comparing the viceregal homiletic's reflection on Christian preaching to the existing homiletics of Jason Meyer, Thomas Long, and John Stott.

Chapter Summaries

Chapter 1

The thesis began by engaging the work of James Kay, who claims that North American homiletics has proceeded according to a rhetorical rather than theological frame of reference. After examination, Kay's work was found overly to imply a binary differentiation between the rhetorical frame of reference and the theological, but his general observation regarding the regnant role of rhetoric in North American homiletics was affirmed, particularly by observing the contemporary landscape of homiletical publications. This led to the central question of the chapter: what does theological reflection, though interspersed with rhetorical reflection, uniquely offer to homiletics?

The chapter offered an answer to this question by referring to two insights from John Henry Newman's *The Idea of a University*. The first, that theological reflection allowed for homiletics to grasp its ultimate grounds in the Christian God, was complemented by Thomas Torrance's concept of Christian contingency, and also yielded insight regarding the integrity and value of rhetorical reflection devoid of any theological consideration. The second, that

education differed from instruction because it engendered philosophical reflection rather than practical engagement, noted that the majority of contemporary homiletical reflection is concerned with instruction rather than education in Christian preaching.

The chapter concluded that theological reflection uniquely contributes to homiletics because it scrutinizes Christian preaching in light of Christian preaching's ultimate grounds in the Christian God, and constructs an understanding of Christian preaching in relation to the rest of God's world. Theological reflection on preaching therefore does not merely aim to develop skills and methods, but moves towards referring all things in the act of Christian preaching to "their true place in the universal system, understanding their respective values, and determining their mutual dependence."[1] The theological homiletician is a philosopher of preaching, for he observes it as an ordered whole in the sight of God.[2] Theological reflection in homiletics allows the homiletician to do this.

In summary, then, theological reflection uniquely opens the ability for homiletics to engage in an ongoing philosophical appraisal of the act of Christian preaching. It allows homileticians continually to reevaluate how preaching intersects with the world, including the world's physical, moral, spiritual, and cultural aspects. Significantly, it allows homiletics to propose how preaching fits into God's creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Jesus Christ, and therefore to justify homiletics' distinctly Christian character and mission.

Based on this chapter's discussion, one proposal and two implications came into view regarding what theological reflection specifically offers to the contemporary state of North American homiletics. Taken together, these

---

1. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, ed. Frank M. Turner (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University, 1996) 99.

2. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 99f.

highlight the unique position of the viceregal homiletic in relation to existing homiletical reflection.

The proposal was stated as follows: North American homiletics has concerned itself with training preachers, not philosophers of preaching. The reason, then, that rhetoric has held priority over theology is that instruction has held priority over education. Instruction has been the constant, and education the variable.

Two implications followed this proposal. First, if a fundamental ability of any academic discipline is to grasp the object of its investigation, it is theological reflection which finally legitimizes homiletics as the discipline which scrutinizes Christian preaching. Theological reflection grants an ability to grasp what Christian preaching is in its entirety; it allows comprehension of Christian preaching so that homiletics may describe, critique, and teach it.[3] The result of these dynamics is that, inasmuch as North American homiletics has ignored theological reflection as part of its mission, it has disallowed its work to be truly homiletical; it has mistaken general scrutiny of public speaking to be the scrutiny of Christian preaching.

A second observation followed the first: absent a sustained project of theological reflection, the discipline of homiletics lacks philosophical connectedness with the rest of the Christian intellectual tradition's witness to God's person and work, for it cannot see how its own tasks are connected to God's great acts of creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Jesus Christ. It therefore suffers from a profound and fundamental deficiency of self-understanding. Absent theological reflection, sustained rhetorical reflection can only maintain this philosophical myopia; it can only gaze upon Christian

3. Here, "comprehend" is used in contrast to "apprehend," the former term denoting a comprehensive understanding or grasp of something, and the latter denoting a genuine perception of something, though only in part.

preaching itself, but cannot clearly discern the Christian God, nor preaching in terms of the Trinity's activity.

These implications gave context to the viceregal homiletic's unique position and promise for contemporary North American homiletics. Because the viceregal homiletic proceeds almost exclusively in a theological mode of reflection, it not only differs from the majority of contemporary homiletical reflection, but offers a needed remedy to contemporary homiletics' philosophical myopia.

Chapter 2

Chapter 2 aimed to differentiate the viceregal homiletic from other modes of theological reflection used in contemporary homiletics in North America. By examining contemporary examples of theological reflection in homiletics, the chapter surveyed three modes of theological reflection, outlining some of their strengths and deficiencies and differentiating them from the viceregal homiletic.

The insight-theological mode reflects on preaching using discrete insights from Scripture or theology. The works of John MacArthur, John Stott, Anna Florence, and Jay Adams were presented as examples of insight-theological appropriation of discrete Scriptural insights. Though this kind of theological reflection aims to remain close to the teaching of Scripture, it was observed that it does not consistently attempt to produce a comprehensive appraisal of the act of preaching. This was partly due to its form of reflection, wherein discrete insights are grouped together without clear structure, but also due to its reliance upon word studies, which can limit its appraisal of preaching to what Scripture says directly about preaching.

The works of Richard Lischer, Michael Pasquarello, and Peter Adam were presented as examples of insight-theological appropriation which brings discrete theological ideas into homiletics. The depth of engagement exhibited by this kind of insight-theological reflection was noted, but again, due to its form of reflection, this mode was observed to lack an internal unity. Here, Richard

Lints's work suggested that simply accruing insights from Scripture or theology about preaching may create an understanding of preaching which undercuts its essential unity. In this way, then, the insight-theological modes may belie a misunderstanding of the nature of Christian Scripture, which itself presents an essentially unified view of the world.

The works of Gerhard Forde, Marjorie Suchocki, James Kay, and Bryan Chapell were presented as examples of the systematic-theological mode of reflection in homiletics. The systematic-theological mode, though fecund and potent to describe aspects of preaching, was observed to be dependent upon the quality and the priorities of the theology with which the homiletician chose to dialogue. Revisionist examples of Christian theology, for example, were demonstrated to produce understandings of the act of preaching which can sharply diverge from what the Church has historically believed and practiced. In addition, the systematic-theological mode was found simply to reuse previously existing theology to describe preaching, rather than producing theological content specifically to describe what contemporary preaching is.

The biblical-theological mode of reflection was found to produce canonically-attuned insights into the act of preaching. Here, the work of Jason Meyer was engaged, noting that it accrued and canonically arranged insights about preaching, but lacked a clear overall synthesis of what Scripture implies regarding the substance common to all preaching. It therefore was unable to offer an appraisal of contemporary preaching in light of redemptive history both past and future.

Chapter 2 as a whole suggested that theological reflection in contemporary homiletics is both varied and fecund, yet struggles to offer a theological account of preaching which synthetically reflects both the entirety and the unity of the Christian canon. Contemporary homiletics lacks, in the words of Richard Lints, a "theological vision" of contemporary preaching: a view of contemporary preaching informed by the content and form of Scripture's

development.[4] Such a theological vision for homiletics would illuminate preaching in a direct and sustained manner while also noting its proximity to God's greater acts, past and future, of creation, redemption, and consummation in Jesus Christ.

In contrast to the contemporary homiletical reflection surveyed in this chapter, the viceregal homiletic's use of biblical theology strives for this kind of theological reflection for homiletics. In this process, the viceregal homiletic pursues the ideological precursor of Christian preaching, that is, it attempts to construct the uncreated divine idea which precedes and informs all acts of Christian preaching. It aims to view Christian preaching as a prototypical idea. In this, the chapter suggested that the viceregal homiletic is a project in, to use John Newman's words, pushing Christian preaching up to its first principles and locating its "true place in the universal system," understanding its value and determining its mutual dependencies.[5] In this, it attempts to offer a philosophy of Christian preaching relevant for contemporary homiletics in a manner distinct from existing North American theological reflection for homiletics.

Chapter 3

Chapter 3 began to demonstrate that the biblical-theological work, particularly the biblical-theological method, of Beale[6] aligns with and enhances the viceregal homiletic's areas of uniqueness. The chapter has introduced and probed Beale's method by differentiating it from other biblical theologies. In response to critiques of Beale's work which noted his use, or overuse, of intertextuality, the

---

4. Richard Lints, *The Fabric of Theology: A Prolegomenon to Evangelical Theology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993) 261.

5. John H. Newman, *The Idea of a University*, 99.

6. Gregory K. Beale, *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011); Gregory K. Beale, *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999); Gregory K. Beale, ed., *The Right Doctrine From the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1994); Gregory K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity, 2004); Gregory K. Beale, *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry* (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Academic, 2008).

chapter suggested that perhaps Beale's work is better understood in the light of Brevard Childs's model for biblical theology, particularly Childs's insights regarding the "theological task" of biblical theology.

Along the way, our discussion suggested that describing the preacher as a Christian viceregent connects the viceregal homiletic to the strengths of Beale's biblical-theological reflection, and that Beale's strengths correspond with the viceregal homiletic's areas of uniqueness.

Chapter 4

Chapter 4 presented and engaged critically Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency in order to develop what the viceregal homiletic means when it says that the preacher is a Christian viceregent. The viceregal homiletic particularizes for homiletical reflection Beale's idea that all Christians are viceregents, stating that the preacher is a Christian viceregent: a human who, through the work of Christ, expresses God's rule over the creation.

The chapter summarized Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency as follows: humanity's creation in the image of God means that they are the viceregents of God's creation, meant to pursue Genesis 1:26-28. Though none of them succeeded,[7] the Adamic commission was pursued by Adam, Noah, the patriarchs, the leaders of Israel, and the nation of Israel as a whole.[8] An enduring and unresolved theme of the Old Testament is God's intent for a human, mirroring Adam in Eden, to rule over and subdue the earth.[9] The advent of Jesus marked the beginning of humanity's reinstatement to an Adamic, viceregal role in creation. Jesus Christ's life, death, and resurrection both inaugurate and exemplify this reinstatement of human viceregal presence.[10] "[Christ's]

7. Beale, *NTBT*, 917.
8. Beale, *NTBT*, 45-51.
9. Beale, *NTBT*, 88-116.
10. Beale, *NTBT*, 427.

resurrected body was the literal beginning of the latter-day new creation and his obedient reign in that new creation."[11]

Through the Holy Spirit,[12] the Church experiences and participates in Christ's restoration of human viceregal rule over the earth.[13] The Church receives a renewed Adamic viceregency because of its identification with Jesus.[14] Through this identification, the Holy Spirit revivifies the image of God in redeemed humans,[15] and thus moves towards Genesis 1-3's hope of a creation ruled in God's name by human viceregents. This identification will be complete at Christ's return, but is now active in an inaugurated eschatological manner because of the enthronement of Jesus at the Father's right hand.[16]

The chapter then discussed Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency by identifying four key ideas within it. Each of these ideas provided a point at which to liken or differentiate Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency from existing understandings. The four key ideas are:

1) Adam's identity "in the image of God" is congruent with Adam's mission to "rule over and subdue."
2) Christians today identify with Jesus Christ, who is the one true viceregent.
3) Adam's mission was intended to expand Eden.
4) Adam's mission would be eschatologically completed.

Several insights emerged from this discussion.

First, Beale's understanding of "in the image of God" has significant commonality with the understanding of several Dutch Calvinist scholars. The

---

11. Beale, *NTBT*, 479.
12. Beale, *NTBT*, 559-613.
13. Beale, *NTBT*, 651-749.
14. Beale, *NTBT*, 308-310.
15. Beale, *NTBT*, 913-916.
16. Beale, *NTBT*, 916.

chapter demonstrated that though Beale does not argue for why Adam should be thought of only according to his rule, Beale's implied support of this position placed him with a majority of scholars in understanding Adam's identity and rule. Beale's understanding of Adam's identity was also noted to fit more consistently with the Dutch Calvinist model of threefold relationship than did Hoekema's.

Regarding the second key idea, the discussion suggested that Beale understands "identifying with Christ" to mean "being united with Christ and experiencing the benefits of his resurrection." This understanding of identification was seen as key to Beale's Christian viceregency because it illuminates how Christians today participate and benefit from Christ's viceregency over creation. Further, the idea that Jesus is the one true viceregent was shown by visiting five facets of Beale's work: a) Christ the Old Testament "son of God", b) Christ the king who images God, c) Christ the "son of man", d) Christ as obedient in temptation, and e) Christ the keeper and filler of creation. The discussion then suggested that Beale's reading of the Synoptics in light of Pauline language, a decision without critical defense from Beale, might better be considered as part of a Childsian Christocentric rereading of Scripture. This suggestion extended Chapter 3's argument that Beale's entire project exhibits characteristics of Brevard Childs's method for biblical theology, and again suggested that Beale's work may not cohere within the methodological categories he uses to describe it.

Regarding the third key idea, this chapter's discussion noted how Beale understands the expanding intent of Adam's mission. The discussion differentiated Beale's understanding of extending Eden from Rushdoony's theonomic understanding of Christians taking dominion. It was shown that Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency implied that Christians exert dominion according to the ironic character and pattern of Christ's rule, and therefore differently informed Christian engagement than Rushdoony's vision for Christians to gain societal dominance.

Regarding the fourth key idea, this chapter noted that in Beale's reflection, the lens of inaugurated eschatology refracts the entire canon of Scripture rather than just the New Testament or the teachings of Jesus. Though such an inaugurated eschatological reading of the entirety of Scripture is not absent from recent Dutch Calvinist systematic theology, this feature of Beale's reflection makes it distinctive among biblical theologies. The discussion suggested that Beale's ubiquitous use of the term "eschatology" might be taken as commentary regarding reality as centered on the Christian God of Christian Scripture.

The chapter concluded by showing the viceregal homiletic's distinctiveness in light of these four ideas. Centralizing the statement that the preacher is a viceregent of God, the viceregal homiletic considers directly the preacher in relation to the Christian God. It therefore proceeds in a theological mode, and positions itself to give an account of how Christian preaching is a uniquely Christian activity. Homiletical reflection emanating from the concept of viceregency, then, is positioned to address the lacuna of contemporary homiletical reflection in a theological mode. Secondly, Beale's understanding of viceregency enhances homiletical reflection by providing a unified theological center: a synthesizing idea which is itself integrated into the larger ideological structure of the canon of Scripture. The preacher as a viceregent is a stable image of what preachers are at all times and in all places: a typal rendering of the preacher which captures timeless and essential characteristics shared by acts of Christian preaching in every epoch of redemptive history. In this way, the viceregal homiletic unifies its reflection on Christian preaching in a way that contemporary homiletical reflection in the theological mode has not done.

From this unified ideological center, the chapter showed that the viceregal homiletic is able to make summative statements regarding what Christian preaching is, and began to articulate those statements. These statements were:

1. Preaching images God; it is a sign of his rule and presence on earth.

    - Because Christ is the only perfect image of God, it is only Christ who preaches; preachers, as humans redeemed in Christ, participate in Christ's imaging God.
2. Preaching is a human act which expands the reign of God.
    - Preaching is Christ's ruling over and subduing creation, which aims to fill the entire creation with the glory and presence of God.
    - Preachers, as recipients of the benefits of Christ's resurrection, obey God's commands, and share in Christ's suffering and exaltation.
3. Preachers participate in Christ's viceregency.
    - The authority of Christian preaching is not dominating.
4. Preaching is a foretaste of humanity's glorification.
    - The speech of the preacher is inaugurated redeemed speech.
    - Preachers speak and act imperfectly until the Last Day.

Chapter 5

Chapter 5 contrasted three existing homiletics, Jason Meyer's *Preaching: A Biblical Theology*, Thomas Long's *The Witness of Preaching*, and John Stott's *Between Two Worlds*, with the viceregal homiletic.

Concerning Jason Meyer's homiletic, our discussion suggested that Meyer's reflection does not exhibit the progression of stewarding and heralding through different eras of redemptive history as clearly as it could. Further, while Meyer rightly expanded his scope of inquiry to arrive at what he calls a biblical theology of the ministry of the word, our discussion noted that the viceregal homiletic pursues its biblical theology of Christian preaching by establishing a biblical theology of humanity redeemed in Christ, in which it locates Christian preaching. This, our discussion suggested, allows the viceregal homiletic to more clearly and consistently reflect on how the function of, to use Meyer's phrase, "heralding and stewarding" interconnects with the humanity of the preacher.

Regarding Thomas Long's homiletic, our discussion showed that both the viceregal homiletic and Long's homiletic consider the source and quality of the "way of thinking and reasoning" that they draw into homiletical reflection. Each chooses a central image from a domain of knowledge that it has found suitable to

inform its homiletic. The domain of knowledge from which the viceregal homiletic draws its central way of reasoning is Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency. Though Long states that his *preacher as witness* image is drawn from a legal context, his understanding of that context is fundamentally rooted in the Christian understanding of the Christian God.

Long's homiletic differed from the viceregal homiletic in the choice of its central image, as well as in the fact that viceregal homiletic's central image more clearly incorporates and gives context for additional, subsidiary images within itself.

Our discussion showed that John Stott's *preacher as bridge builder* image engages theological concepts though at times without reckoning fully with the context from which those concepts spring. This lexical inconsistency affects how Stott's central image is communicated, rendering its exact meaning somewhat uncertain. The unique Christian character of preaching, per Stott's homiletic, lies in the importance of the message preached, and the preacher's intentional and faithful communication of that message. Per Stott's homiletic, Scripture is relevant for the world today, and good preaching thus requires a preacher of Christian maturity working hard to make clear its relevance.

In contrast to Stott's homiletic, the viceregal homiletic provides a clear and stable central image that is able to unify and organize its homiletical reflection: the preacher as a Christian viceregent. As Chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis demonstrated, all of these images are the result of a comprehensive, theologically attuned, biblical-theological reading of Scripture, akin to Brevard Childs's Christological rereading of the canon, emerging from Beale's biblical-theological method and understanding of Christian viceregency. This differentiates the viceregal homiletic's images from other central images which draw from a single passage or concept found in Scripture, or proceed from the homiletician's assertion.

The viceregal homiletic is a new and distinct model for homiletical reflection because it considers the preacher as a Christian viceregent, following Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency. The *preacher as a Christian viceregent* is the central image of the viceregal homiletic, while the other summative statements noted in Chapter 4 function as images subordinated to the first:

- The preacher is a sign of God's rule and presence.
- The preacher is a human who expands the reign of God.
- The preacher is a participant in Christ's viceregency.
- The preacher is an eschatological foretaste of humanity's glorification.

The five homiletical foci of the viceregal homiletic, which our chapter also mentioned, are as follows:

A) Preaching is a Christian practice.

B) Christian preaching is grounded in the person and work of Jesus.

C) Preaching is a human act; the preacher images God on earth, and Christian preaching expands the kingdom of God in creation.

D) The authority of the preacher's speech derives from the viceregal authority of Jesus.

E) Preaching is part of God's eschatological project of bringing all things in submission to Christ, and is a foretaste of fallen humanity and its speech being brought into that submission.

The viceregal, then, portrays Christian preaching to be a Christian practice whose identity and shape is rooted in the Christian God's creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Jesus Christ. It states that Christian preaching today, or in any era of history, is like Adam's rule in Eden, and that the speech of the preacher participates in Christ's viceregal authority, an authority which is now truly manifest in creation, but which will be perfected at the Last Day.

This final chapter completed the discussions of the four prior chapters of this thesis, and has shown that the viceregal homiletic is a fresh and distinct homiletical model.

Research Question and Answer

This thesis has argued that a particular perspective on Christian preaching, informed by the Christian concept of viceregency and summarily titled "the viceregal homiletic," is a new and distinct model for homiletical reflection. The viceregal homiletic's distinctiveness lies in its critical choice and development of G.K. Beale's understanding of Christian viceregency into a governing image for the Christian preacher.

Summary of Original Contributions

The Relationship of Rhetoric and Theology in Christian Homiletics

The viceregal homiletic contributes a clear understanding of the value and role of both rhetorical reflection and theological reflection for contemporary homiletics.

In summary, the viceregal homiletic claims that Christian preaching does not consist essentially of the preacher speaking according to a specific rhetorical form, nor functioning like an expert in the knowledge of Scripture. Rather, it is through the preacher's redeemed humanness that he shares in Christ's viceregal authority to preach.

Rhetoric, then, if understood as the faculty by which a human identifies and deploys the available means of persuasion in particular circumstances,[17] is a legitimate tool for preachers. As Christian preachers arrange texts, ideas, images, and/or words so that other humans will hear and understand the words of Scripture, this represents an ordering of creation and a participation in Jesus's viceregal forwarding of God's kingdom. Rhetorically shaping a sermon is a way

17. Cf. Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1:2.

of cultivating and ordering the ideological creation to teach the commands of Jesus to other humans.

Yet the use of rhetoric in a sermon necessarily presupposes the preacher's viceregal authority over creation. The viceregal homiletic provides a clear biblical-theological rationale for why the preacher is able, when viewed in light of the Christian God, to consider Christian preaching rhetorically. In this, the viceregal homiletic contributes a theological justification for all rhetorical modes of homiletical reflection.

The Preacher as a Christian Viceregent

This thesis has suggested that there is significant value in homiletical reflection choosing to view the preacher as a Christian viceregent. As this thesis has shown, this central trope suggests that Christian preaching results not merely from a preacher faithfully interpreting an ancient text for contemporary listeners. Rather, it has given an example of how Christian preaching can be understood as cohering within the Christian God's creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Jesus Christ. The viceregal homiletic suggests that Christian preaching can only occur within the creation in which Christ was born, died, and rose again. Relatedly, Christian homiletics can only cohere consistently within an ideological space defined by these creedal realities. Jesus Christ is the ultimate ground of the act of Christian preaching.

Whether using this central image or not, however, the arc of discussion in this thesis suggests three criteria for a strong and clear homiletical image.

1) Reflects theologically on Christian preaching

A clear central image springs from and encourages theological consideration of Christian preaching. Theological reflection alone provides the ability for homiletics to evaluate how Christian preaching fits into God's creation, redemption, and consummation of all things in Jesus Christ, and therefore to justify and explicate homiletics' distinctly Christian character and mission. Chapter One also observed the necessity of not pitting the theological and

rhetorical modes of reflection against one another, and, referring to insights from Thomas Torrance, proposed that both modes' unique contributions can be affirmed.

2) A unified understanding of Christian preaching derived from the entire Scriptural witness.

This thesis has shown that a strong central image for homiletical reflection springs from a unified and integrated understanding of Scriptural teaching rather than an uncoordinated accrual of insights from Scripture or elsewhere. Following Richard Lints,[18] the thesis suggested that Scripture exhibits an inherent unity of structure and message, and so, rather than consisting of various Scriptural images of preachers or of uncoordinated groups of Scriptural data about Christian preaching, homiletical reflection faithful to Christian Scripture should aim to offer a unified understanding of Christian preaching derived from the totality of the Scriptural witness.

3) Pursues Christian preaching directly.

The viceregal homiletic assumes that Christian preaching is a specific created entity which is important, for the sake of the Church and for the discipline of homiletics, to describe. This thesis suggested that the viceregal homiletic therefore develops its account of Christian preaching directly, not indirectly or derivatively. Though it builds on the work of other scholars from other disciplines, particularly Beale's biblical theology and understanding of Christian viceregency, it does so critically, and without sacrificing the creational integrity of Christian preaching.

Christian Preaching's Uniquely Christian Character

This thesis has presented an original account of how Christian preaching is uniquely Christian. The chapters showed how, by extending Beale's biblical-theological account of Christian viceregency, the viceregal homiletic holds that Christian preaching is a Christian practice, and that preachers are Christians.

18. Richard Lints, *The Fabric of Theology*, 261.

Christian preaching, both as a project and as a practice, is grounded in the person and work of Jesus. Preaching is a human act in which the preacher images God; Christian preaching expands the kingdom of God in creation. The authority of the preacher's speech derives from the viceregal authority of Jesus. Preaching is part of God's eschatological project of bringing all things in submission to Christ.

Finally, Christian preaching is a particular exertion of and participation in redeemed viceregal speech. Like Adam's speech, the preacher's words image the speech of God and extend temporally and ideologically the prior naming of God. Preaching names and orders creation as Adam's speech was intended to. The act of Christian preaching itself represents a foretaste of the eschatological redemption of all human speech.

The Eschatological Redemption of Human Speech

The speech of the Christian preacher proceeds from a person being redeemed in the image of God, and therefore participating in Christ's viceregency today. Just as Adam's speech was originally intended to image the speech of God, naming creation as God had named, the speech of the Christian preacher seeks to image the speech of God today. Christ's death and resurrection has inaugurated the redemption of the preacher, such that the preacher can and does image God on earth. However, he does still sin, and will intermittently fail to image God successfully until the Second Coming. Likewise, Christ's resurrection has inaugurated the redemption of the speech of the Christian preacher. The preacher's words therefore have capacity to voice God to creation today, yet will intermittently fail continually to do so until the Second Coming. Christian preaching therefore represents a convergence not only of divine and human action, but of divine and human words.

Topics for Future Study

This thesisleaves several areas undeveloped for possible future study. The following discussion will clarify three of these.

The Scope of Homiletics as a Discipline

In its claim that homiletics has an obligation to attend not only to rhetorical concerns but theological concerns, this thesis raises the question: what exactly is homiletics? This thesis has argued that theological reflection ultimately differentiates the discipline of homiletics from simply being the study of speech communication or rhetoric.

This thesis nevertheless leaves at least two questions here unaddressed: first, how does the fledgling body of hermeneutical analyses in evangelical homiletics fit into the theological or rhetorical modes of reflection, and therefore into the thesis's understanding of what the discipline of homiletics entails? Second, what biblical and theological resources are appropriate and helpful for homileticians desiring to reflect more in a theological mode than a rhetorical one?

The Authority of Preaching

The question of whether human speech can carry authority without subjugating or dehumanizing others has been a fecund area of conversation in contemporary North American homiletics. This is perhaps due to the influence of deconstructionist philosophies of language and the unprecedented examples of oppressive and violent speech witnessed in the twentieth century. Richard Lischer notes the pitfalls of claiming to speak for God in the midst of contemporary violence, while others, such as Doug Pagitt, propose methodological responses which remove authoritative pulpit speech from the Church.[19] The viceregal homiletic's method of describing the preacher's authority as the viceregal authority of Christ, however, may grant new avenues to consider the authority of Christian preaching in terms of Christ's authority exerted according to the pattern of Christ's crucifixion and resurrection.

---

19. Richard Lischer, *The End of Words* (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005). Doug Pagitt, *Preaching Re-Imagined: The Role of the Sermon in Communities of Faith* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005).

The Canon as Deposit of Inaugurated Eschatological Speech

The viceregal homiletic's claim that Christian preaching today represents a foretaste of the eschatological redemption of human speech opens a new avenue for reflection on the nature of the human speech in the canon of Christian Scripture. If human speech is in the process of being redeemed, and if it will, as the viceregal homiletic suggests, become congruent with the speech of God at the Last Day, then the canon of Scripture can be understood as the authoritative deposit, or foretaste, of human speech's future redemption, which therefore voices the speech of God to creation. In this light, the canon emerges as a key example of redeemed Adamic viceregal rule operating on earth, and particularly as an example of the people of God successfully imaging God through human speech. This theological understanding of the canon of Scripture is not fundamentally incongruous with existing statements regarding the inspiration of Scripture widely accepted among North American evangelical homileticians, yet a revisiting of the theological substructure of evangelical articulations of inerrancy might yield significant fruit. Further, the viceregal homiletic's understanding of the canon of Scripture positions North American homiletics to dialogue more directly with twentieth and twenty-first century dogmatic and systematic theological reflection regarding the inspiration of Scripture, both Protestant[20] and Roman Catholic.[21]

20. E.g. Karl Barth, *The Word of God and the Word of Man*, trans. Douglas Horton (Gloucester, Massachusetts: Peter Smith, 1978). John Webster, *Holy Scripture: A Dogmatic Sketch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2003).

21. E.g. Matthew Levering, *Engaging the Doctrine of Revelation: The Mediation of the Gospel through Church and Scripture* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, Peter. *Speaking God's Words: A Practical Theology of Expository Preaching.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1986.

Adams, Jay E. *Preaching With Purpose: The Urgent Task of Homiletics.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982.

Allen, Ronald J., Barbara S. Blaisdell, and Scott B. Johnston. *Theology for Preaching: Authority, Truth, and Knowledge of God in a Postmodern Ethos.* Nashville: Abingdon, 1997.

Aristotle, *The Works of Aristotle.* Translated by W. Rhys Roberts. London: Oxford University Press, 1924.

Arthurs, Jeffrey D. *Preaching as Reminding: Stirring Memory in an Age of Forgetfulness.* Downers Grove: Intervarsity Academic, 2017.

Athanasius. *On the Incarnation.* Yonkers, New York: St. Vladmir's Seminary Press, 2011.

Atkinson, William P. *Trinity After Pentecost.* Cambridge: Lutterworth Press, 2014.

Bahnsen, Greg L. *Theonomy in Christian Ethics.* Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1984.

Barker, William S., and W. Robert Godfrey, eds. *Theonomy: A Reformed Critique.* Grand Rapids: Academie Books, 1990.

Barr, James. "Childs' Theologies." In *The Concept of Biblical Theology: An Old Testament Perspective.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1999.

Barth, Karl. *Church Dogmatics.* 4 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1956-1975.

———. *Homiletics.* Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley and Donald E. Daniels. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991.

———. *The Word of God and the Word of Man.* Translated by Douglas Horton. Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1978.

Bartow, Charles L. *God's Human Speech: A Practical Theology of Proclamation.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Bauckham, Richard. *Living With Other Creatures.* Waco: Baylor University, 2011.

Beale, Gregory K. *The Book of Revelation: A Commentary on the Greek Text.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

———. *Handbook on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament: Exegesis and Interpretation.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012.

———. *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation.* Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 166. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

———. *A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2011.

———. ed. *The Right Doctrine From the Wrong Texts? Essays on the Use of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1994.

———. *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God*. Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity, 2004.

———. *We Become What We Worship: A Biblical Theology of Idolatry*. Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Academic, 2008.

Beale, Gregory K., and D. A. Carson. *A Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.

Beaudean, John W. *Paul's Theology of Preaching*. Macon: Mercer University, 1988.

Berkof, Hendrikus. *Man in Transit*. Translated by Richard Wolff. Wheaton: Key, 1971.

Berkhof, Louis. *Systematic Theology: New Combined Edition*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996.

Berkouwer, Gerrit C. *Man: the Image of God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984.

Boersma, Hans, and Matthew Levering. "Spiritual Interpretation and Realigned Temporality." *Modern Theology* 28.4 (October 2012): 587-596.

Bonhoeffer, Dietrich. *Finkenwalde Lectures on Homiletics*. In Clyde E. Fant, *Bonhoeffer: Worldly Preaching*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1975.

Brightman, F.E. "Byzantine Imperial Coronations." *Journal of Theological Studies* 2 (1901): 359-392.

Briscoe, Stuart. *Preach It!* Loveland: Group, 2004.

Broadus, John A. *A Treatise on the Preparation and Delivery of Sermons*. Edited by Edwin C. Dargan. New York: A.C. Armstrong, 1898.

Brower, Kent E. Review of *The Temple and the Church's Mission* by Gregory K. Beale. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 31.5 (August 2009).

Brueggemann, Walter. "Canon Fire: The Bible as Scripture." *Christian Century* (December 4, 2001): 22-26.

———. *Finally Comes the Poet: Daring Speech for Proclamation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

———. *The Practice of Prophetic Imagination: Preaching an Emancipating Word*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2012.

———. Review of *A New Testament Biblical Theology* by Gregory K. Beale. *Interpretation* 67.1 (January 2013): 74-76.

———. *Texts Under Negotiation: The Bible and Postmodern Imagination*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. London: SCM, 1952-1955.

Burke, Kenneth. *Grammar of Motives.* Berkeley: University of California, 2009.

Buttrick, David. *A Captive Voice: The Liberation of Preaching.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.

———. *Homiletic: Moves and Structures.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

———. "Foreword." In Craig A. Loscalzo, *Preaching Sermons That Connect: Effective Communication Through Identification.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1992.

Calvin College Curriculum Study Committee. "Christian Liberal Arts Education." Grand Rapids: Calvin College, 1970.

Calvin, John. *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Edited by John T. McNeill. Louisville: John Knox Press, 2011.

Campbell, Charles. *Preaching Jesus: The New Directions for Homiletics in Hans Frei's Postliberal Theology.* Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2006.

Chapell, Bryan. *Christ-Centered Preaching.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.

Childs, Brevard S. *Biblical Theology: A Proposal.* Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2002.

———. *Biblical Theology in Crisis.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1970.

———. *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments.* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

———. *Isaiah: A Commentary.* Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004.

Childs, C.J. and Nancy L. deClaissé-Walford, Review of *The Witness of Preaching* 3rd ed. by Thomas G. Long. *Review & Expositor* 115.1 (February 2018): 138-140.

Ciampa, Roy. "The History of Redemption." In *Central Themes in Biblical Theology: Mapping Unity in Diversity.* Edited by Scott Hafemann and Paul R. House. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.

Clowney, Edmund P. *Preaching and Biblical Theology.* Phillipsburg: P&R, 2002.

———. *Preaching Christ in All of Scripture.* Wheaton: CrossWay, 2003.

Craddock, Fred B. *As One Without Authority.* Nashville: Abingdon, 1971.

———. *Overhearing the Gospel.* Nashville: Abingdon, 1978.

———. *Preaching.* Nashville: Abingdon, 1985.

Cullmann, Oscar. *Christ and Time: The Primitive Christian Conception of Time and History.* Translasted by V. Filson. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1950.

Dempster, Stephen G. *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible.* Grand Rapids: Intervarsity, 2003.

Dodd, C.H. *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology.* London: Nisbet, 1952.

Dollar, Harold E. Review of *The Temple and the Church's Mission* by Gregory K. Beale. *Missiology*, 34.1 (January 2006): 81-83.

Dooyeweerd, Herman. "A New Critique of Theoretical Thought." In *Collected Works of Herman Dooyeweerd*, Series A, Volumes 1-4. Edited by D.F.M. Strauss. Lewiston: E. Mellen Press, 1997.

Driver, Daniel R. *Brevard Childs: Biblical Theologian for the Church's One Bible*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.

Duduit, Michael. "The 25 Most Influential Preaching Books of the Past 25 Years." *Preaching*. February 5, 2010. Accessed August 16, 2018. http://www.preaching.com/sermon-illustrations/11625882/.

Ellingsen, Mark. *The Integrity of Biblical Narrative: Story in Theology and Proclamation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1980.

English, Donald. *An Evangelical Theology of Preaching*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.

Eslinger, Richard L. *A New Hearing: Living Options in Homiletic Methods*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1987.

———. *The Web of Preaching: New Options in Homiletical Method*. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002.

Firth, David G. Review of *The Temple and the Church's Mission* by Gregory K. Beale. *European Journal of Theology* 18.2 (2009): 195-196.

Forde, Gerhard O. *Theology is for Proclamation*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Forde, Gerhard O., Mark C. Mattes, and Steven D. Paulson. *The Preached God: Proclamation in Word and Sacrament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.

Freeman, Harold. *Variety in Biblical Preaching: Innovative Techniques and Fresh Forms*. Waco: Word Books, 1987.

Frey, Bradshaw. *All of Life Redeemed: Biblical Insights for Daily Obedience*. Jordan Station: Paideia, 1983.

Gaffin, Richard B. *The Centrality of the Resurrection*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1978.

Gage, Warren Austin. *The Gospel of Genesis: Studies in Protology and Eschatology*. Winona Lake: Carpenter Books, 1984.

Gibson, Scott M. *Should We Preach Someone Else's Sermon?: Preaching in a Cut-and-Paste World*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009.

———. "The Legacy of John Stott's *Between Two Worlds*." Eerdword: the Eerdmans blog. July 24, 2017. Accessed August 11, 2018. http://eerdword.com/2017/07/24/the-legacy-of-john-stotts-between-two-worlds/.

Goldsworthy, Graeme. *Preaching the Whole Bible As Christian Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Greidanus, Sidney. *The Modern Preacher and the Ancient Text: Interpreting and Preaching Biblical Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

Griswold, Alfred W. "Liberal Education is Practical Education." In *Liberal Education and the Democratic Ideal: and other essays.* New Haven: Yale University, 1964.

Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Theology.* Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 1981.

Harrisville, Roy, and Walter Sundberg. *The Bible in Modern Culture: theology and historical-critical method from Spinoza to Käsemann.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.

Hogan, Lucy L., and Robert Reid. *Connecting with the Congregation: Rhetoric and the Art of Preaching.* Nashville: Abingdon, 1999.

Hood, Jason. *Imitating God in Christ: Recapturing a Biblical Pattern.* Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 2013.

Horton, Michael. "In God's Name: Guidelines for Proper Political Involvement." *Modern Reformation Magazine* 3.5 (September/October 1994).

Kato, Alex. "The Theology Behind the Books We Choose." Paper presented at the Evangelical Homiletics Society Conference, 2017, South Hamilton, Massachusetts.

Kay, James F. *Christus Praesens: A Reconsideration of Rudolf Bultmann's Christology.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

———. *Preaching and Theology.* St. Louis: Chalice, 2008.

———. "Reorientation: Homiletics as Theologically Authorized Rhetoric." *The Princeton Seminary Bulletin* 24.1 (2003): 16-35.

Keller, Timothy. *Preaching: Communicating Faith in an Age of Skepticism.* New York: Viking, 2015.

Ker, Ian. "Newman's Idea of a University and Its Relevance for the 21 Century." *Australian eJournal of Theology* 18.1 (April 2011).

Klein, Ernest. *Klein's Comprehensive Etymological Dictionary of the English Language.* Amsterdam: Elsevier, 1979.

Klein, William W. "*A New Testament Biblical Theology: The Unfolding of the Old Testament in the New.* A Denver Journal Review by Denver Seminary professor William W. Klein." *Denver Journal* 16 (Jul 12, 2013). Accessed August 16, 2018. https://denverseminary.edu/resources/ news-and-articles/a-new-testament-biblical-theology-the-unfolding-of-the-old-testament-in-the-new/.

Kline, Meredith G. *Kingdom Prologue: Genesis Foundations for a Covenantal Worldview.* Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2006.

———. "A Study in the Structure of the Revelation of John." Unpublished paper, Westminster Theological Seminary, 1945.

Knowles, Michael P. *We Preach Not Ourselves: Paul on Proclamation.* Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2008.

Koller, Charles W. *How to Preach Without Notes.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997.

Kuruvilla, Abraham. *Privilege the Text!: A Theological Hermeneutic for Preaching*. Chicago: Moody, 2013.

———. *A Vision for Preaching: Understanding the Heart of Pastoral Ministry*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2015.

Kuyper, Abraham. *Lectures on Calvinism: Six Lectures Delivered at Princeton University Under Auspices of the L.P. Stone Foundation*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Ladd, George E. *The Gospel of the Kingdom*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975

———. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

Larsen, David L. *The Anatomy of Preaching: Identifying the Issues in Preaching Today*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1989.

Levenson, Jon D. *Sinai and Zion*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985.

Levering, Matthew. *Engaging the Doctrine of Revelation: The Mediation of the Gospel through Church and Scripture*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.

Lints, Richard. *The Fabric of Theology: A Prolegomenon to Evangelical Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.

Lischer, Richard, ed. *The Company of Preachers*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

———. *The End of Words: The Language of Reconciliation in a Culture of Violence*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

———. *A Theology of Preaching: Dynamics of the Gospel*. Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 1992.

———. "Why I am Not Persuasive." *Homiletic* 24.2 (Winter 1999): 13-16.

Litfin, Duane. *Paul's Theology of Preaching: The Apostle's Challenge to the Art of Persuasion in Ancient Corinth*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity Academic, 2015.

Locke, John. "Some Thoughts Concerning Education." In *The Works of John Locke, the twelfth edition*. London: C. and J. Rivington, 1824.

Lockyer, Herbert. *The Art and Craft of Preaching*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1975.

Long, Thomas G. *The Witness of Preaching*. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, 1989.

Luther, Martin. *Luther's Works* [American Edition], 55 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1955-1986.

MacArthur, John F. "Expository Preaching in a Postmodern World, Part 1." *Grace to You*. Accessed August 16, 2018, http://www.gty.org/resources/Articles/A152/Expository-Preaching-in-a-Postmodern-World-Part-1.

———. "A Response to Homiletics and Hermeneutics." In *Hermeneutics, Inerrancy, and the Bible*. Edited by Earl Radmacher and Robert Preus. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1984.

MacArthur, John F., and The Master's Seminary Faculty. *Rediscovering Expository Preaching.* Edited by Richard L. Mayhue and Robert L. Thomas. Dallas: Word, 1992.

Manson, William. "Eschatology in the New Testament." In *Eschatology: Four Papers Read to the Society for the Study of Theology*, SJTOP 2. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1953.

Marshall, I. Howard. Review of *A New Testament Biblical Theology* by Gregory K. Beale. *Themelios* 37.2 (July 2012): 307-310.

McCartney, Dan G. "Ecce Homo: The Coming of the Kingdom as the Restoration of Human Vicegerency." *Westminster Theological Journal* 56.1 (Spring 1994): 1-21.

McDaniel, Chip. Review of *The Temple and the Church's Mission* by Gregory K. Beale. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 49.1 (March 2006): 187-188.

McDill, Wayne. *The 12 Essential Skills for Great Preaching.* Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994.

McGrath, Alister E. *Christian Theology: An Introduction.* 3rd edition. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.

McKim, Donald K. *The Bible in Theology and Preaching.* Nashville: Abingdon, 1985.

McVicar, Michael J. *Christian Reconstruction: R. J. Rushdoony and American Religious Conservatism.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, 2015.

Meyer, Jason C. *Preaching: A Biblical Theology.* Wheaton: CrossWay, 2014.

Middleton, J. Richard. *The Liberating Image: The Imago Dei in Genesis 1.* Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2005.

Mohler, R. Albert. "A Theology of Preaching." In *Handbook of Contemporary Preaching.* Edited by Michael Duduit. Nashville: Broadman, 1992.

Moyer, R. Larry. *Show Me How to Illustrate Evangelistic Sermons.* Grand Rapids: Kregel, 2012.

Neuhaus, Richard J. "Why Wait for the Kingdom?: The Theonomist Temptation." *First Things* (May 1990).

Newman, John H. *The Idea of a University.* Edited by Frank M. Turner. New Haven: Yale University, 1996.

Niehaus, Jeffrey J. *God at Sinai: Covenant and Theophany in the Bible and Ancient Near East.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995.

North, Gary. *Unconditional Surrender: God's Program for Victory.* Tyler: Institute for Christian Economics, 1983.

Oakes, Edward T. "Newman's Ideal University." *First Things* (March 2011): 35-39.

Pagitt, Doug. *Preaching Re-Imagined: The Role of the Sermon in Communities of Faith.* Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005.

Pasquarello, Michael. *Christian Preaching: A Trinitarian Theology of Proclamation.* Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 2011.

Patterson, Paige. "Ancient Rhetoric: A Model for Text-Driven Preachers." In Daniel L. Akin, David Allen, and Ned L. Matthews, *Text-Driven Preaching.* Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2010.

Payne, Brian K. "The Summing Up of all Things in Christ and the Restoration of Human Viceregency: Implications for Ecclesiology." Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2008.

Piper, John. *The Supremacy of God in Preaching.* Grand Rapids: Baker, 1990.

Ratzinger, Joseph. *Dogma and Preaching: Applying Christian Doctrine to Daily Life.* Edited by Michael J. Miller. Translated by Michael J. Miller and Matthew J. O'Connell. San Francisco: Ignatius, 2011.

———. *The Nature and Mission of Theology: Approaches to Understanding Its Role in the Light of the Present Controversy.* Translated by Adrian Walker. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1995.

———. *The Spirit of the Liturgy.* Translated by John Saward. San Francisco: Ignatius, 2000.

Reid, Robert S., ed. *Slow of Speech and Unclean Lips: Contemporary Images of Preaching Identity.* Eugene: Cascade, 2010.

Renwick, David. Review of *The Temple and the Church's Mission* by Gregory K. Beale. *Lexington Theological Quarterly*, 42.1 (Spring 2007): 70-72.

Resner, André. *Preacher and Cross: Person and Message in Theology and Rhetoric.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Richardson, Alan. *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament.* New York: Harper, 1958.

Ridderbos, Herman. *The Coming of the Kingdom.* Edinburgh: Christian World Publications, 1979.

———. *Paul: An Outline of His Theology.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

Robinson, Haddon W. *Biblical Preaching: The Development and Delivery of Expository Messages.* Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1980.

———. *Biblical Preaching: The Development and Delivery of Expository Messages.* Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001.

Rushdoony, Rousas J. "Dominion Man." Audio recording transcript. Accessed August 16, 2018. http://www.pocketcollege.com/transcripts/014%20-20Contemporary%20Cultural%20Ethics%20(15%20was%20a%20duplicate%20of%20this)/RR132D7.html.

———. "Salvation and Godly Rule." Audio recording transcript. Accessed August 16, 2018. http://www.pocketcollege.com/transcripts/091%20-20Salvation%20and%20Godly%20Rule/RR136C5.html.

Rushdoony, Rousas J., and Herbert W. Titus. *The Institutes of Biblical Law: A Chalcedon Study*. Nutley: Craig Press, 1973.

Schmaus, Michael. *Preaching as a Saving Encounter*. Staten Island: Alba House, 1966.

Schreiner, Thomas. *The King in His Beauty: a Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2013.

Schrotenboer, Paul G. *Man in God's World: The Biblical Idea of Office*. Pittsburgh: Radix, 1989.

Scobie, Charles H. *The Ways of Our God: An Approach to Biblical Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Sire, James W. *Discipleship of the Mind: Learning to Love God in the Ways We Think*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1990.

Smith, Christine M. *Preaching as Weeping, Confession, and Resistance: Radical Responses to Radical Evil*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1992.

Snow, Charles P. *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*. New York: Cambridge University, 1959.

———. *The Two Cultures: And a Second Look; an Expanded Version of the Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*. New York: Cambridge University, 1969.

Spykman, Gordon J. *Reformational Theology: A New Paradigm for Doing Dogmatics*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

Stanley, Andy, and Lane Jones. *Communicating for a Change*. Sisters: Multnomah Publishers, 2006.

Stevenson, Geoffrey. *The Future of Preaching*. Norwich: SCM Press, 2010.

Stott, John R.W. *Between Two Worlds*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.

———. *The Cross of Christ*. Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 1986.

———. *A Preacher's Portrait*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.

Strong, Roy. *Coronation: From the 8th to the 21st Century*. London: Harper Perennial, 2005.

Suchocki, Marjorie H. *The Whispered Word: A Theology of Preaching*. St. Louis: Chalice, 1999.

Taylor, Barbara B. *The Preaching Life*. Cambridge: Cowley, 1993.

Tell, David. "Burke's Encounter with Ransom: Rhetoric and Epistemology in 'Four Master Tropes.'" *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* (Fall 2004): 33-54.

Terrien, Samuel L. *The Elusive Presence: Toward a New Biblical Theology*. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1978.

Thielman, Frank S. *A Theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2011.

Torrance, Thomas F. *The Ground and Grammar of Theology*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia, 1980.

———. "The Ground and Grammar of Theology." Lecture given at Fuller Theological Seminary, 1981. Cassette tape recording.

———. *The Mediation of Christ.* Colorado Springs: Helmers & Howard, 1992.

———. *Reality and Evangelical Theology: The Realism of Christian Revelation.* Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 1999.

Troeger, Thomas H. *Ten Strategies for Preaching in a Multimedia Culture.* Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.

Van Til, Cornelius. *The Defense of the Faith: An Introduction to Systematic Theology.* Philadelphia: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1974.

Vos, Geerhardus. *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948.

———. "The Idea of Biblical Theology." In *Redemptive History and Biblical Interpretation: the Shorter Writings of Geerhardus Vos,* edited by Richard B. Gaffin. Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1980.

Vos, Geerhardus, and Richard B. Gaffin. *The Pauline Eschatology.* Phillipsburg: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1994.

Wallace, Ronald S. *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament.* Tyler: Geneva Divinity School, 1982.

Walsh, Brian J., and J. Richard Middleton. *The Transforming Vision Shaping a Christian World View.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1984.

Webster, John. *Holy Scripture: A Dogmatic Sketch.* Cambridge: Cambridge University, 2003.

Wiersbe, Warren W. *Preaching & Teaching with Imagination: The Quest for Biblical Ministry.* Wheaton: Victor, 1994.

Willimon, William H. *Conversations with Barth on Preaching.* Nashville: Abingdon, 2006.

———. *The Intrusive Word: Preaching to the Unbaptized.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

———. *Peculiar Speech: Preaching to the Baptized.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.

Wilson, Paul S. *Preaching and Homiletical Theory.* Louisville: Chalice, 2004.

Winter, Irene J. "Art in Empire: The Royal Image and the Visual Dimensions of Assyrian Ideology." In Assyria 1995: Proceedings of the 10 Anniversary Symposium of the Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, Helsinki, September 7-11, 1995. Edited by S. Parpola and R.M. Whiting Helsinki: The Neo-Assyrian Text Corpus Project, 1997.

Wolters, Albert M. *Creation Regained: A Transforming View of the World.* Leicester: Intervarsity, 1986.

Wright, John W. *Telling God's Story: Narrative Preaching for Christian Formation.* Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 2007.

Wright, Nicholas T. *Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.